

Columbia County School District

Belmont Academy



2021-22 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Columbia 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Belmont Academy

1476 SW WALTER AVE, Lake City, FL 32024

www.belmontacademy.com

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>45%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>17%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Columbia 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.

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	Position 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.
Pierce, Stephanie	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.
Tillotson, Apryll	School Counselor	Oversees the MTSS process and supports student needs. This involves serving the whole child and their mental wellness.
Royster, Barbara	Instructional Coach	Assists the teachers in performing their duties to impact student growth to the maximum extent possible. Works with the team to monitor school progress and maintain high academic standards.
Harris, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Assists the teachers in performing their duties to impact student growth to the maximum extent possible. Works with the team to monitor school progress and maintain high academic standards.

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.*

3

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

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

777

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

5

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

16

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	53	56	53	55	66	65	67	64	64	62	53	42	33	733
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	5	4	7	2	4	5	7	6	9	8	12	81
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	3	2	1	4	2	1	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	0	0	3	1	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	8	5	2	0	1	1	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	4	3	6	3	1	4	1	2	25
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	4
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	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
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

2020-21 - 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	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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				86%	69%	61%	82%	64%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	62%	59%	63%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	57%	54%	62%	52%	52%
Math Achievement				86%	73%	62%	81%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains				73%	67%	59%	71%	59%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	57%	52%	78%	58%	52%
Science Achievement				87%	77%	56%	77%	68%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				96%	86%	78%	89%	81%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	93%	68%	25%	58%	35%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	90%	62%	28%	58%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				
05	2021					
	2019	86%	59%	27%	56%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
06	2021					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	54%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
07	2021					
	2019	85%	53%	32%	52%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
08	2021					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	56%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
09	2021					
	2019	94%	47%	47%	55%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
10	2021					
	2019	90%	49%	41%	53%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	89%	70%	19%	62%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
05	2021					
	2019	89%	65%	24%	60%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2021					
	2019	86%	69%	17%	55%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	90%	63%	27%	54%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
08	2021					
	2019	65%	36%	29%	46%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	95%	59%	36%	53%	42%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		-95%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	63%	14%	67%	10%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	72%	26%	71%	27%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	63%	37%	70%	30%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	87%	64%	23%	61%	26%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	50%	39%	57%	32%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	48	44		42	27	25					
ASN	100			100							
HSP	60			45	30						
MUL	73	40		47	30						
WHT	82	58	47	74	46	24	78	71	76	96	55
FRL	67	44	33	62	43	47	78	69			

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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	695

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

4th and 8th grade showed a high level of proficiency in ELA at 86%, while 6th and 7th grade showed a decline in proficiency. 5th and 6th grade math were an area of weakness at 62% and 52% proficiency. 3rd grade and Geometry were both areas of relative strength in math.

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

The greatest needs for improvement can be identified as learning gains in the lowest quartile (bottom 25%) for math and learning gains as a whole in English Language Arts.

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

Some contributing factors to these areas of weakness were related to the hardships that Covid-19 placed on the school. Students spent extended periods of time out of school due to quarantines. Intervention schedules were also impacted as absences of staff greatly impacted those schedules. In order to improve that area, we must hire more reliable substitutes and ensure that our interventionists are working with high efficacy. The school may need to consider hiring a full time ESE teacher to support the pre-existing teacher.

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

An area that showed improvement is in Science Achievement. It increased from a 77 in 2019 to a 78 in 2021.

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

This improvement came from the work of a teacher to learn new skills as well as the use of Performance Matters to monitor growth.

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

We will utilize our new instructional coaches to support development of teachers, with a concentration on student engagement, vocabulary strategies, training regarding the Multi-Tiered of Supports, etc. An additional ESE teacher and interventionists will be added to the staff to support effective academic intervention for students. New curriculum components will be utilized and teachers will be trained in using the tools. This will include the use of Exact Path and Hear Builder.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Development opportunities will include a focus on phonics/phonemic awareness, vocabulary strategies, engagement techniques, MTSS, Support for Students with Disabilities, and personalized coaching via the building level Instructional Coach.

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

There will be a concentration of services for intensive math including a focus on spiral review and the ALEKS math program being implemented with fidelity. Data will be collected quarterly and all content areas will complete a benchmark/progress monitoring assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Belmont will focus on FSA ELA growth as identified as an area of weakness for 2020-2021 data.

Measurable Outcome: Student learning gains will increase from 56% to 68%.

Monitoring: Monitored by benchmark assessments through STAR Reading, Study Island, Performance Matters and new benchmark assessments associated with new curriculum from MyPerspectives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ron Barker (ron@belmontacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using best teaching practices such as student engagement, vocabulary strategies, and effective feedback to improve learning gains for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By using certain learning strategies that we feel can impact our student success, student learning gains will improve significantly. Resources used will be Instructional Coaches and purchased supplemental resources such as Renaissance and Study Island. Instructional Coaches will lead professional development not only in program use but best teaching practices. Instructional Coaches will lead professional learning in new curriculum from MyPerspectives and Wonders along with monitoring its implementation school wide.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor student data and lead data meetings in all core subjects quarterly.

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

Instructional Coaches will lead professional development on learning programs such as Study Island and Renaissance along with professional development on student engagement, vocabulary strategies and effective feedback. Instructional Coaches will lead professional learning in new curriculum from MyPerspectives and Wonders along with monitoring its implementation school wide.

Person Responsible Jessica Harris (jessica.harris@belmontacademy.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Belmont will focus on FSA Math growth as identified as an area of weakness for 2020-2021 data.

Measurable Outcome: Student learning gains in bottom quartile will increase from 27% to 59%.

Monitoring: Monitored by benchmark assessments through Study Island, Performance Matters, Exact Path and Aleks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ron Barker (ron@belmontacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using best teaching practices such as student engagement, effective feedback and math manipulatives to improve learning gains for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By using certain learning strategies that we feel can impact our student success, student learning gains will improve significantly. Resources used will be Instructional Coaches and purchased supplemental resources such as Study Island, Exact Path and Aleks. Instructional Coaches will lead professional development not only in program use but best teaching practices.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor data and utilize data meetings to achieve success for all students.

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

Instructional Coaches will lead professional development on learning programs such as Study Island, Exact Path, and Aleks along with professional development on student engagement and effective feedback.

Person Responsible Barbara Royster (barbara.royster@belmontacademy.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Belmont Academy is ranked 125 out of 313 schools and falls into the low risk category. In 2019-2020, there were a total of 55 disciplinary referrals with 11 of them coded as hitting another student. We plan to decrease the amount of referrals in the new school year, but have to take special care to introduce the approximately 150 students to our school culture. Our goal will be to introduce the new students to our school House System and Knights 55 in order to support their development as high functioning members of society.

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.

Belmont Academy implements a house system based on practices shared from the Ron Clark Academy in Atlanta. This is a points-based system that promotes 55 positive behaviors and their use in daily interactions. The school believes that learning can and should be fun, but still holds a high level of expectations for academic rigor. This is evident in our trainings and activities to promote student engagement, as well as the activities that the school offers to engage parents in to the school. Our students and parents report that Belmont feels like family!

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

Parents are required to complete 100 hours of volunteering throughout the year. The way this is implementing varies based on the family needs. Some parents volunteer at PTO events, while others may come and work in a classroom weekly. Volunteers sign up to bake for House events and other activities to earn hours. We welcome all to come in for activities to the best of our ability though it has been impacted by Covid in recent years. We keep an open door policy for parents to come in and meet with administration or teachers. Our school has various committees that include stakeholders from the community, parents, and students. Our governing board is made up of parents. Our SAC committee is made up of those that reflect our student population in terms of diversity.

The PTO is an open organization that does not require fees to be involved in it. Sign ups are sent out all the time inviting parents to volunteer for events and school activities. There are many opportunities for parents and other stakeholders to engage in activity with the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$21,866.66
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0402 - Belmont Academy	Title II		\$10,933.33

			<i>Notes: Elementary Instructional Coach</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0402 - Belmont Academy	Title II		\$10,933.33
			<i>Notes: Secondary Instructional Coach</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$3,321.10
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0402 - Belmont Academy	Title II		\$3,321.10
			<i>Notes: PD supplies for student engagement and developing instructional strategies to build up the lowest quartile.</i>			
					Total:	\$25,187.76