

Pinellas County Schools

Belcher Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Belcher Elementary School

2215 LANCASTER DRIVE., Clearwater, FL 33764

<http://www.belcher-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Belcher Elementary School

2215 LANCASTER DRIVE., Clearwater, FL 33764

<http://www.belcher-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">51%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Believe – Act-Achieve; Believe that all students can learn and Act on those beliefs so that all children can Achieve at their highest level.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lewis, Dawn	Principal	School Leader
Blackman, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Dawn Lewis

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

479

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	49	83	78	75	75	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	438
Attendance below 90 percent	0	28	31	26	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	1	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	10	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/6/2022

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	47	76	74	81	83	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	16	17	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	12	17	10	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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

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	47	76	74	81	83	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	16	17	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	12	17	10	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	

Students with two or more indicators 1 1 1 3 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 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	

Retained Students: Current Year 2 2 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6

Students retained two or more times 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	55%	56%				55%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						61%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						50%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	62%	51%	50%				62%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						67%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						57%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	62%	59%				56%	53%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	59%	56%	3%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	56%	-11%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	60%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	27	50	47	36	57	44	17				
ELL	50	43		59	67		39				
ASN	80			100							
BLK	33	59		46	53						
HSP	56	63		55	65	40	45				
MUL	67			80							
WHT	56	60	48	62	65	59	56				
FRL	48	64	46	53	58	42	53				

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	26	53		27	64		43				
ELL	46	74	70	48	55		55				
ASN	71			93							
BLK	28			38							
HSP	52	78		51	53		42				
MUL	82			91							
WHT	58	71		57	61		74				
FRL	47	67	59	49	57	27	62				
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	19	29	35	26	51	59					
ELL	34	59	61	50	60	56	24				
ASN	80			90							
BLK	31	52		47	65		45				
HSP	43	62	58	53	55	43	36				
WHT	63	62	42	67	72	62	65				
FRL	49	54	45	53	59	56	48				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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	90
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	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Belcher scholars have increased performance in ELA in 3rd and 4th grade (3rd – 53%, 4th – 56%). This area has improved with a strong focus in the rigor of instruction and addressing gaps in foundational skills. Math, especially in 4th grade benefited from the strategic intervention groups based on subgroup analysis was implemented in response to progress monitoring data. 4th grade Math made a notable increase of 18% from the 2021 FSA assessment.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

5th grade data in all content areas showed the greatest decline, dropping 3% to 60% proficiency on the ELA and dropping 9% to 55% proficiency in Science. The largest decline and greatest area of opportunity is 5th grade math. Belcher 5th graders declined 13% dropping to a 57% proficiency on the 2022 FSA. There were gaps in knowledge of the 5th grade standards and test item specifications in all content areas. Math showed the greatest opportunity for growth with noticeable foundational gaps

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

Increasing attendance in the lower performing students and ensuring teachers are working closely with coaches to build knowledge and teaching capacity throughout the school year. Attendance tracking and problem solving with the Child Study Team will increase to ensure attendance,

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math showed the greatest improvement because it was a major, schoolwide focus for the 21-22 school year. Teachers worked collaboratively on standards-based planning and implementing rigorous, student-centered core instruction in order to drive improvement. We addressed this challenge specifically in the primary grades to ensure students enter third grade on level

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

To address the challenge in Math, the team collaboratively planned together, and worked with a Math coach to build knowledge throughout the school year. District Math supports as well as internal coaching was utilized after data supported the need for increased rigor.

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

- Utilize assessment purposefully in PLCs (i.e., Common Exit Tickets, evidence of student learning, pre-requisite assessments, and Unit Assessments).
- Team unit planning based on all data available.
- Rigorous core instruction paired with daily targeted interventions and acceleration in response to current data.

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.

Teachers will engage in PD to deepen knowledge of BEST Standards and planning rigorous tasks. They will participate in unit planning and team data analysis to create an individual action plan for each scholar. This PD will be delivered in weekly PLCs.

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

A stronger emphasis on lower performing students attending Promise time tutoring and Summer Bridge programs will be offered for acceleration and enrichment.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

2022 this subgroup fell below the minimum 41%. The current federal index is 35% . The problem/gap is occurring because students were not exposed to curriculum at the level of rigor prescribed the Florida Standards. With daily rigorous student-centered instruction in ELA, Math and Science for all scholars and subgroups, the federal index will increase by 7%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The percent of all ESE students proficient will increase by 7% as calculated by the federal index.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Daily walkthroughs, progress monitoring data and observations with feedback will be used to monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all ESE (L25) students during core, differentiated and intervention instruction with a strong focus on the foundational skills in K-5

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

When teachers utilize grade level content to create engaging lessons that include complex tasks, encourage students to utilize questioning to elaborate on content, students are able to purposefully activate and transfer knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Participate in professional development associated with but not limited to the above evidence based strategies.

Provide time for gen ed and ESE staff to collaborate and co-plan on developing SDI that meets the needs of students.

Collaborate to create a schedule that promotes a “push-in” model of learning support (VE Resource Starr and general education teachers) delivery of services.

Create a climate where IEPs are adjusted as needed based on the data and needs of students to maximize the SDI based on skill deficits or improvements so that regular and purposeful adjustments can be made.

Provide embedded PD and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction.

Ensure the ESE teachers receive on going PD aligned to implementing standards-based instruction.

Continue to cluster ESE students and build them in the master schedule first in order to optimize service delivery and focus on a clustering process to meet student needs.

Person Responsible Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

2022 FSA data resulted in 55% proficiency in ELA, The problem/gap is occurring because students did not have enough practice at the level of rigor prescribed by the B.E.S.T. Standards. With daily rigorous student-centered instruction in ELA for all scholars and subgroups, proficiency will increase to 65%. In addition, learning gains will increase to 70% for all categories.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 55% to 65%, as measured by the FAST Assessment of 2023.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Proficiency levels in every classroom will be monitored by unit assessments, formative assessments, and standard-based teacher-made assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

When teachers have a full understanding of the standards, the grade level expectations and are armed with strategies to deliver the content with fidelity , student proficiency rates will increase.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Become familiar with the vertical progression and standards design in order to understand what students are expected to master.
- Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.
- Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as ELA Expectations) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

Person Responsible Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

<p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</p>	<p>Eliminate the gap between the proficiency rates in reading (ELA) and mathematics for black and non-black students. Current data indicates that our African American students are at 33% proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and 46% in Math as compared to their white peers with 56% proficiency in ELA and 62% in Math.</p>
---	---

<p>Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</p>	<p>Common Assessment and the 2023 FAST Assessment will show 55% of African American students will be performing at or above proficiency in both ELA and Math.</p>
--	---

<p>Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</p>	<p>Proficiency levels in every classroom will be monitored using Unit assessments, formative assessments, and standard-based teacher-made assessments.</p>
--	--

<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)</p>
--	--------------------------------------

<p>Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.</p>	<p>Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. Provide training for culturally relevant disciplinary practices and ensure strong implementation. Implement Restorative Practices throughout the school. Conduct monthly discipline disparity/restorative practices training with school administrators.</p>
---	--

<p>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.</p>	<p>At Belcher we will continue a commitment to culturally relevant curriculum, materials, and training in support of rigorous, engaging instruction in all classrooms. By meeting the level of all grade level standards with focus on creating access for all students, equity can be achieved.</p>
--	--

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Assure all teachers attend district-level training on Culturally Relevant Teaching practices.
2. Incorporate a focus on the Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies during grade level unit planning.
3. Monitor the use of Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies during classroom visits and observations.

<p>Person Responsible</p>	<p>Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)</p>
----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our current level of performance is an average of 12 behavior calls per day, as evidenced by the classroom behavior call log. The problem is occurring because of an inconsistency in the understanding and application of behavioral expectations.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

When expectations are clearly defined and taught, the behavior calls will be reduced by 50% to no more than 6 calls per day.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Discipline call log data is collected in an electronic database and is shared at faculty meetings and grade-level PLCs. This will be monitored bi-weekly at SBLT to discuss and put into place interventions for students to feel success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Implement a schoolwide PBIS plan, including PD for teachers and stakeholders to ensure understanding and effective implementation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Strategies and actions are based on research and evidence-based nationally recognized PBIS program. The specific strategies and actions within our SIP were selected to match our school-specific needs based on our review of data utilizing an equity problem-solving process

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

A system of recognition will be established to provide rewards to students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified in the expectations/rules.

Person Responsible

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Professional Development on culture responsiveness.

Person Responsible

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

All classrooms follow school wide PBIS plan and align Classroom Management Plans with strong focus on positive reinforcement methods .

Person Responsible

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

2022 data resulted in 55% proficiency in Science. The problem/gap is occurring because students did not have enough practice at the level of rigor prescribed the the Florida Standards. With daily rigorous student-centered instruction in Science for all scholars and subgroups, proficiency will increase .

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Common Assessment data in Science will show 65 % of our students will perform at or above proficiency

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Daily walkthroughs, progress monitoring data and observations with feedback will be used to monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Utilize science curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Instruction will be explicitly planned at the level of rigor defined by the Florida Standards. Additionally, teams will plan utilizing an Equity Mindset, and with Culturally Relevant Teaching within a classroom that provides supportive structures through PBIS and Restorative Practices

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark. this will be achieved by ensuring that teachers have a full understanding of the content and are engaged in vertical articulation,

- Ensure grades 1-5 have a deep understanding of the science lab curriculum, materials management, and pacing/scheduling

Person Responsible

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2022 FSA data resulted in 62% proficiency in math. to continue to increase proficiency, scholars must have enough practice at the level of rigor to match standards. With daily rigorous student-centered instruction in Math for all scholars and subgroups, proficiency will increase to all 70% performing at or above proficiency for all categories.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: Common Assessment data and the FAST assessment will show 70% of students performing at or above proficiency.

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: Proficiency levels in every classroom will be monitored us Unit assessments, formative assessments, and standard-based teacher-made assessments.

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When teachers have a full understanding of the standards, the grade level expectations and are armed with strategies to deliver the content with fidelity , student proficiency rates will increase.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Become familiar with the vertical progression and standards design in order to understand what students are expected to master.
- Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.
- Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as grade level expectations) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

Person Responsible Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school maintains a comprehensive PBIS plan that is shared with all stakeholders and explicitly taught and practiced across the year to cultivate a positive school culture and environment. Everyone is responsible

for their words, actions and contributing to the supportive network.

Family Engagement events are planned across the year with the specific focus of increasing trusting relationships around the four C's (1) cognition- beliefs and values (2) connections networks (3) capabilities , skills and knowledge (4) confidence – self-efficacy. The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

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

Stakeholders include administrators, teachers, support staff, scholars, families, the School Advisory Committee, PTA and community members. Each serves as a critical partner in this process