

Gilchrist County School District

Bell Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Bell Elementary School

2771 E BELL AVE, Bell, FL 32619

<https://www.gilchristschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Nell Hartsfield

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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)	98%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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

This plan was approved by the Gilchrist County School Board on 11/17/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Bell Elementary School

2771 E BELL AVE, Bell, FL 32619

<https://www.gilchristschools.org/>

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	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Gilchrist County School Board on 11/17/2020.

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.

Bell Elementary School wants to help students form relationships by giving them the tools they need to be successful in the 21st Century. At BES, we believe that all students can learn. Safety and student learning are the two most important elements of a school. In addition, we believe that parents, students, and teachers must work together as partners in order to ensure student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bell Elementary School cares for their students and staff through patience, truth, trust, kindness, forgiveness, and dedication.

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
Mathe, Suzanne	Principal	The principal and assistant principal will ensure that decision making is data-based, monitor the implementation of the MTSS/RTI by the school based team, assess MTSS/RTI skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, provide adequate professional development to support MTSS/RTI implementation.
Hartsfield, Nell	Assistant Principal	The principal and assistant principal will ensure that decision making is data-based, monitor the implementation of the MTSS/RTI by the school based team, assess MTSS/RTI skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, provide adequate professional development to support MTSS/RTI implementation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Nell Hartsfield

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.*

4

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

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)	98%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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	82	85	85	79	84	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	22	22	28	13	26	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	10	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	4	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	21	19	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	1	11	8	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	12	15	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/20/2020

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	103	102	101	90	98	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	28	19	19	7	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	6	7	4	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	14	26	32	12	18	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

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	9	10	7	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	16	12	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	103	102	101	90	98	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	28	19	19	7	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	6	7	4	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	14	26	32	12	18	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

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	9	10	7	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	16	12	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	71%	72%	57%	69%	67%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	72%	58%	64%	65%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	62%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	77%	63%	75%	71%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	66%	62%	76%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	50%	51%	74%	61%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	74%	53%	54%	55%	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	67%	70%	-3%	58%	9%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	67%	1%	58%	10%
	2018	73%	66%	7%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	74%	74%	0%	56%	18%
	2018	63%	66%	-3%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	80%	-7%	62%	11%
	2018	72%	75%	-3%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	72%	-8%	64%	0%
	2018	77%	78%	-1%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	72%	77%	-5%	60%	12%
	2018	60%	70%	-10%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	72%	2%	53%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	60%	68%	-8%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
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	48	70	63	43	43	29	50				
ELL	69	82		69	45						
HSP	74	83		74	67						
WHT	70	68	53	70	54	31	79				
FRL	64	71	58	62	47	29	67				
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	47	62	62	42	46	36	29				
HSP	62	64		60	38						
WHT	69	66	50	73	55	44	65				
FRL	63	65	51	67	53	42	57				
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	51	58	55	51	54	73	27				
HSP	50	30		61	60						
WHT	72	66	55	77	77	82	57				
FRL	63	53	43	69	71	69	48				

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	62
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	64
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	
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	70
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

Multiracial Students	
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	61
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	56
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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile Gains is the data component that performed the least (37%). In 2017 this data component was 74%, in 2018 the performance was 44%, and in 2019 the performance was 37%. Contributing factors were teachers working with a new math curriculum and learning about Math Discourse.

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

In 2019 there were 2 components that had a decline from the prior year. Math achievement declined by 2% and math lowest 25th percentile gains declined by 7%. Contributing factors were teachers working with a new math curriculum and learning about Math Discourse.

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.

In 2019 Math Lowest 25th percentile gains had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The school had 37% of students making gains compared to the state having 51% of students making gains. This is a 14% less than the state's average.

Math Learning gains is another area of a gap between school and state. The school had 56% of all students making learning gains and the state had 62% of all students making learning gains. This is

6% less than the state's average.

Contributing factors were teachers working with a new math curriculum and learning about Math Discourse.

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

Science achievement is the data component with the most improvement. In 2017 this component performance was 54%, in 2018 this component performance was 63% and in 2019 the performance increased to 77%. This seems to be a trend that we hope will continue. Steve Wilson (Science professional) performed a science assembly for 3rd - 5th grade students and a separate assembly for the 5th graders a few weeks prior to the FCAT Science Test. The fifth grade science teacher created a content focus document (Ladder of Science Big Ideas) for kindergarten through fourth grade teachers to help build background and areas to focus their instruction.

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

Attendance and Level 1 on state assessments are a concern during a regular school year. This year's pandemic could result in students to be out of school for contact tracing or positive test results. This could lead to higher attendance issues, lower academic scores and more students with social / emotional needs this year.

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

1. Math Learning Gains including Lowest 25th Percentile Gains
2. English Language Arts Lowest 25th Percentile Gains
3. English Language Arts Achievement with focus on writing
4. Science
5. Social / Emotional

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Learning Gains including lowest quartile
In 2019, 44% of all 4th graders and 68% of all 5th graders made a year's growth in math as determined by school grade learning gains calculations. 32% of lowest quartile 4th graders and 47% of lowest quartile 5th graders made a year's growth in math as calculated by school learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: 75% of all students to make a year's growth or more as determined by school learning gains

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Suzanne Mathe (mathes@mygcsd.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning Community (PLC)
Math Discourse
Facilitation support
New textbook series and curriculum resources
IReady instruction
Mastering Math Facts

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The negative trend in 4th grade learning gains (including lowest quartile) requires a focus on improvement in this area. Giving teachers professional development will allow them to learn and implement new strategies which will lead to an increase in learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Learning Community (PLC) - meeting with teachers, training and observations by administrators using the IPG with feedback provided to teachers
2. Kindergarten through 5th grade teachers review math discourse materials with administrators observing and providing feedback on math discourse
3. Facilitation support provided to ESE students and students needing additional assistance in math
4. Teachers and students will track their progress on IReady and other math assignments / assessments, with Data talks
5. Professional development in differentiated instruction and IReady to maximize the analyzing of reports

Person Responsible: Suzanne Mathe (mathes@mygcsd.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	English Language Arts lowest quartile learning gains In 2019, 60% of all 4th graders and 56% of all 5th graders made a year's growth in ELA as determined by school grade learning gains calculations.
Measurable Outcome:	75% of all students to make a year's growth or more as determined by school grade learning gains
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzanne Mathe (mathes@mygcsd.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Literacy Checks Facilitations Support Intervention Specialist IReady instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Even though the trend is improving in 4th & 5th grade learning gains, the focus on ELA will continue to strive for improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided with proven vocabulary strategies
2. Literacy Checks conducted with feedback provided to teachers
3. Facilitation support provided to ESE students and students needing assistance in reading instruction
4. Intervention Specialist uses "push in" model to assist students needing reading intervention
5. Teachers and students will track their progress on IReady and other reading assignments

Person Responsible Suzanne Mathe (mathes@mygcsd.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	English Language Arts with a focus on writing In 2019, 15% of 4th graders and 18% of 5th graders scored a high essay writing level (8, 9, or 10 points)
Measurable Outcome:	25% or higher of all 4th and 5th graders will score at a high essay writing level (8, 9, or 10 points).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzanne Mathe (mathes@mygcsd.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Gilchrist Reads & Writes Core Connection
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	4th grade improved 2% points from 2018 to 2019 5th grade improved 1% point from 2018 to 2019 More training of teachers on Core Connections and Gilchrist Reads & Writes will improve students' essay writing scores

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Learning Community provided after administering Gilchrist Writes
2. Core Connection writing process
3. Vertical Planning among grade levels during literacy meetings, team representatives share out information
4. Mentoring provided to new teachers (at this school) and new to grade level teachers by reading coach, mentors, and peers.

Person Responsible Suzanne Mathe (mathes@mygcsd.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Science Achievement
Description and Rationale: In 2019, 77% of 5th graders scored a proficient level 3 or higher on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). This is up from 63% in 2018. Bell Elementary School would like for this percentage to continue its upward trend.

Measurable Outcome: 80% or higher of all 5th graders to score at or above the proficiency level of 3

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Suzanne Mathe (mathes@mygcsd.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Focus Materials (Ladder of Science Big Ideas)
 Steve Wilson (Science Expert)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Even though our science trend has been positive, our end of year progress monitoring in Science for grades 3 - 4 produced the following data of proficiency, 3rd grade = 65% and 4th grade = 50%, indicating a strong focus on science should be continued. Steve Wilson excites students which increase their science knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

1. 5th Grade teacher provides focus materials (Ladder of Science Big Ideas) for Kindergarten through 4th grade teachers
2. Steve Wilson to visit school in September to build excitement for science
3. Steve Wilson to visit school in March for 5th grade specific science instruction
4. Science Day planned for entire school participation

Person Responsible Suzanne Mathe (mathes@mygcsd.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership plans to focus on the social / emotional needs of all students during this year of uncertainty. Guidance Counselors teach students using Safety Matters Curriculum. Teachers complete the Universal Screener to identify students in need. New mental health counselor will visit the school weekly to provide services to students. All staff members receive Kognito and Mental Health training.

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.

Bell Elementary School will inform 100% of parents of important school activities. The principal makes weekly Connect Ed phone messages home. Each grade level provides newsletters and / or Remind APP to inform parents of weekly learning and special upcoming activities. Parent are encouraged to attend Families Building Better Learners Night twice a year. Parent Teacher Conference night is held every year in October. The school produces a newsletter to share important information of upcoming activities and amazing happenings with all parents and guardians. The PTO encourages parents to be involved and provides activities throughout the year.

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