

Columbia County School District

Belmont Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Belmont Academy

1476 SW WALTER AVE, Lake City, FL 32024

www.belmontacademy.com

Demographics

Principal: Ron Barker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Belmont Academy

1476 SW WALTER AVE, Lake City, FL 32024

www.belmontacademy.com

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)
Combination School PK-12	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	16%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Create an accelerated learning environment through visionary leadership, qualified and capable teachers, and dedicated, involved parents.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excellence for all students, through visionary leadership, empowered teachers, and involved parents.

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
Barker, Ron	Principal	Oversees day-to-day operations of the school including handling disciplinary matters, managing the budget, and hiring teachers and other personnel. Leads teachers and staff, set goals and ensures students meet their learning objectives.
Jackson, Mandi	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision, and management of the school program and operation.
Sloan, Drew	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision, and management of the school program and operation.
Lloyd, Jody	Other	Manages all non-instructional functions, services, and staff so that the instructional team can maintain a concentrated focus on teaching and student achievement and maximize instructional time.
Pierce, Stephanie	Administrative Support	Serves as a support to the Leadership Team. Oversees the MTSS process and 504 plans on campus.
Wingate, Larana	Administrative Support	Ms. Wingate serves as the Academic Advisor for secondary students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Ron Barker

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.*

2

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

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	55	55	54	52	43	63	44	50	42	43	34	33	17	585	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	3	5	2	6	7	7	4	8	7	5	4	74	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	1	7	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	0	1	1	1	10	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	9

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	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/6/2020

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	51	56	50	36	63	43	45	47	44	35	33	23	25	551	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	2	5	2	5	2	3	2	2	4	2	0	5	46	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	18	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	2	9

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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	

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	51	56	50	36	63	43	45	47	44	35	33	23	25	551	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	2	5	2	5	2	3	2	2	4	2	0	5	46	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	18	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	2	9

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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	

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	86%	69%	61%	85%	64%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	62%	59%	63%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	57%	54%	68%	52%	51%
Math Achievement	86%	73%	62%	76%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	73%	67%	59%	62%	56%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	57%	52%	50%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	87%	77%	56%	70%	62%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	86%	78%	91%	83%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	93%	68%	25%	58%	35%
	2018	81%	58%	23%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	62%	28%	58%	32%
	2018	87%	56%	31%	56%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	86%	59%	27%	56%	30%
	2018	88%	53%	35%	55%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	67%	57%	10%	54%	13%
	2018	90%	52%	38%	52%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
07	2019	85%	53%	32%	52%	33%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	76%	48%	28%	51%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	83%	54%	29%	56%	27%
	2018	78%	51%	27%	58%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
09	2019	94%	47%	47%	55%	39%
	2018	74%	45%	29%	53%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
10	2019	90%	49%	41%	53%	37%
	2018	77%	46%	31%	53%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	89%	70%	19%	62%	27%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	93%	67%	26%	62%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	89%	65%	24%	60%	29%
	2018	88%	68%	20%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	86%	69%	17%	55%	31%
	2018	80%	57%	23%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
07	2019	90%	63%	27%	54%	36%
	2018	85%	54%	31%	54%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	65%	36%	29%	46%	19%
	2018	73%	37%	36%	45%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	95%	59%	36%	53%	42%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	52%	-52%	48%	-48%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	63%	14%	67%	10%
2018	74%	60%	14%	65%	9%
Compare		3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	72%	26%	71%	27%
2018	91%	67%	24%	71%	20%
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	63%	37%	70%	30%
2018	87%	62%	25%	68%	19%
Compare		13%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	64%	23%	61%	26%
2018	100%	51%	49%	62%	38%
Compare		-13%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	50%	39%	57%	32%
2018	60%	46%	14%	56%	4%
Compare		29%			

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	44	53	67	50	53	36					
ASN	100	90		100	90						
HSP	90			90							
MUL	82	80		55	80						
WHT	85	66	62	87	73	60	87	95	85	92	92
FRL	83	66	83	80	70	52	85				
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	29	33		47	58						
HSP	69	50		67	54						
WHT	82	66	64	83	72	83	76	89	76	100	82
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
HSP	79	77		71	69						
WHT	85	62	66	75	60	46	72	93	86		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	889
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	90
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	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	80
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	74
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.

Due to Covid-19, state test scores were not reported for the 2019-2020 school year.

Based on data from the 2018-2019 school year, the data component that showed the lowest performance was Math Lowest 25 Percentile at 59%. Of those students, only 42% made learning gains. This data component was previously on a steady increase prior to this. This can be attributed to a lack of Professional Development that focuses on math instruction for teachers and interventionists alike. A lack of a math intervention curriculum at the school can be another potential contributing factor.

Based on data from the 2018-2019 school year, our overall lowest quartile in ELA 2018-2019 was 67%. When ELA scores are broken down, writing proficiency specifically was only at 51% school-wide. Low proficiency in writing brings down our overall ELA proficiency, as well as learning gains in ELA.

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

The lowest 25th percentile in math showed a decline from 78% proficiency in 2018 to 59% proficiency in 2019. This was the lowest data component in 2019. This data component had been on a steady increase until 2019. This may be due to an influx of students enrolling through the lottery system of students that were significantly below grade level in math. A lack of training for the support staff providing math interventions to those struggling students, as well as the lack of a math intervention curriculum at the school may be other contributing factors.

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.

Due to Covid-19, we are reflecting upon data from the 2018-2019 school year. During this year, Belmont Academy was above the state average on all subjects, grade levels, and subgroups. The largest gap between Belmont's performance and the state average was in Science Achievement. Belmont was 31% above the state average. Hiring two new Science teachers in the last school year to improve student proficiency in Science may have contributed to this, as well as the after school Science Club that was available from students in 1st through 12th grade.

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

In the 2018-2019 school year, the data component that showed the most improvement was Geometry EOC. Proficiency went up by 29% from 2018 to 2019. This can be attributed to Geometry tutoring after school. In addition to the teacher, a tutor was hired 3 days per week to work specifically with students struggling in higher level math.

Another data component that showed significant improvement in is ELA Learning Gains for SWD. Learning gains for SWD increased by 20% from 2018 to 2019. Belmont hired a full time ESE teacher in the 2017-2018 school year whose entire day was dedicated to serving SWD, as well as a paraprofessional to specifically support SWD.

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

In 2019-2020, 49 students had attendance below 90%. In addition to this attendance concern, the school converted to Innovative Learning for all students at the end of the 3rd quarter. Students cannot receive the full benefits of school if they are not present to access the curriculum and teacher. Attendance was not taken during this time of Innovative Learning and many students were not maintaining the rigor of the typical school year.

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

1. The lowest 25th percentile in math will show an increase from 59% proficiency in 2019 to 65% proficiency in 2021.
2. ELA Learning Gains will increase from 68% proficiency in 2019 to 70% proficiency in 2021.
3. Increase support for teachers through mentoring, PD, peer observations, etc.
4. Alignment of academic, social, and behavioral expectations for students among school staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Focus Description and Rationale: The lowest 25th percentile in math showed a decline from 78% proficiency in 2018 to 59% proficiency in 2019. This was the lowest data component in 2019. This data component had been on a steady increase until 2019.

Measurable Outcome: The lowest 25th percentile in math will show an increase from 59% proficiency in 2019 to 65% proficiency in 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maria Randell (maria.randell@belmontacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidenced-based strategies implemented for this area of focus will include professional developments on curricular resources, as well as strategies to increase student engagement and motivation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Math is an area that often is highly affected by student engagement as it requires a lot of steps to complete successfully and does not offer the opportunity to relate it to high interest activities like reading would. Based on the available data from the FSA in 2019, our lowest quartile did not grow as expected. In order to encourage learning gains, students must be engaged and teachers will have to be creative in their delivery method.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional developments will be provided by Belmont staff focusing on curricular resources available to our school that support mathematics (Exact Path, ALEKS, ConnectED, etc.).

Person Responsible: Maria Randell (maria.randell@belmontacademy.com)

A group of our teachers will attend the NCTM Regional Conferences and Exposition in Tampa, FL.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Pierce (stephanie.pierce@belmontacademy.com)

A group of teachers and school leaders will attend the Innovative Schools Conference in Atlanta, Georgia.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Pierce (stephanie.pierce@belmontacademy.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on available FSA data from the 2018-2019 school year, ELA learning gains were only at a 68%. Upon further evaluation of these scores, it was discovered that writing proficiency was an area that was severely lacking at 51%. Low proficiency in writing brings down the overall ELA score.

Measurable Outcome: ELA learning gains will increase from 68% proficiency in 2019 to 70% proficiency in 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Pierce (stephanie.pierce@belmontacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: In order to focus on improving writing proficiency, professional development will be provided on available curricular resources, such as Study Island, Renaissance, ConnectED, Exact Path, etc. We will also focus on professional development to increase student engagement and motivation in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the data from the previous school year, only 51% of students were considered proficient in writing (score of 7 out of 10 or higher). Based on surveys administered to our staff, it indicated that professional development in writing was a high area of need. Teachers also indicated that they would like training in our digital resources to support Innovative Learners.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA teachers will attend a professional development at the Florida Literacy Conference in Orlando, FL (April 2021).

Person Responsible Stephanie Pierce (stephanie.pierce@belmontacademy.com)

PD will be provided on curricular resources by Belmont staff members.

Person Responsible Stephanie Pierce (stephanie.pierce@belmontacademy.com)

Support will be provided by a teacher with specialized training in teaching writing.

Person Responsible Stephanie Pierce (stephanie.pierce@belmontacademy.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Based on survey data from the 2019-2020 school year, teachers have shown a need for additional support. This will be addressed through orientations, needs assessment surveys for teachers, peer mentoring, peer observations, and a variety of other professional development opportunities. This will be achieved by adding a part time instructional coach to support teachers and offering opportunities for teacher modeling/observations and measured through teacher surveys, PD documentation, and follow-up activities.

The school will also continue to address climate and culture using the Knights 55 and House System. The goal is to align academic, social, and behavioral expectations for students among staff. Explicit expectations were developed for students, parents, teachers, and support staff and will be shared with all stakeholders through various methods. In order to demonstrate that this goal was met, we will look for a decrease in referrals and other discipline issues.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$13,418.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0402 - Belmont Academy	Title II		\$7,956.40
			<i>Notes: To increase math proficiency in the lowest quartile administrators and teacher leaders will attend the Innovative Schools Conference to learn how to meet the needs of at-risk and struggling students as well as improve school discipline, climate, and culture.</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0402 - Belmont Academy	Title II		\$5,461.80
			<i>Notes: To increase math proficiency in the lowest quartile, math teachers will attend the NCTM Regional Conference to learn new strategies of teaching math.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$4,641.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0402 - Belmont Academy	Title II		\$4,641.00
			<i>Notes: To increase ELA learning gains from 68% to 70%, Language Arts teachers will attend the Florida Literacy Conference in Orlando, FL.</i>			
Total:						\$29,735.03