Belmont Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Belmont Elementary School

14150 GATE DANCER RD, Sun City Center, FL 33573

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Candice Dodd

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Hillsborough 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.](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

Belmont Elementary School

14150 GATE DANCER RD, Sun City Center, FL 33573

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	No	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21
Grade	D	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Belmont Elementary will provide a high quality education in a safe, respectful and inclusive environment that builds a foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Belmont Elementary students will have success for today and be prepared for tomorrow.

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
Black, Alan	Principal	
Cook, Destony	Assistant Principal	
Canavan, Michelle	Instructional Coach	
Foster, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	
	Reading Coach	Felicia Henderson

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/1/2022, Candice Dodd

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.*
0

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
68

Total number of students enrolled at the school
968

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
17

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	144	167	161	181	130	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	948
Attendance below 90 percent	2	51	51	33	28	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	41	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	61	56	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	1	0	8	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	4	2	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/26/2022

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	171	150	133	147	148	167	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	916
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	13	24	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	171	150	133	147	148	167	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	916
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	13	24	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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	42%	53%	56%					52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%							55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%							50%	53%
Math Achievement	42%	50%	50%					54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	46%							57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%							46%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	59%	59%					50%	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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	23	40	33	21	36	25	9				
ELL	36	50	53	40	46	25	15				
BLK	34	44	27	32	42	42	19				
HSP	38	49	44	40	45	31	29				
MUL	56	67		48	41		43				
WHT	49	60		52	52		43				
FRL	33	45	35	34	42	27	24				

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	27	25		25	27		31				
ELL	37	58		37	46		18				
BLK	35	41		34	17		37				
HSP	41	46		42	48		35				
MUL	61			48							
WHT	59	67		57	67		68				
FRL	37	46	36	36	35	14	41				

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

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	51
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	51
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

On state assessments, proficiency in all subject areas decreased on the school level, while gains and BQ tended to show growth in percentages comparing 2021 to 2022 scores. Most subgroups tended to show a decrease in proficiency as well. Most scores decreased, other than ELA and Math learning gains, which showed growth (ESE, BLK, HSP). 4th grade scored higher proficiency rates than 3rd and 5th comparatively. Science SSA scores showed a marked decreased compared to 2021 scores. Considering primary progress monitoring data, Kindergarten data showed higher rates of students meeting annual growth measures compared to first and second, though second's measures show more growth compared to first. On grade level math scores were higher, but there seemed to be a bigger difference between students were significantly below level compared to mid and on grade level scores.

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

5th grade science scores showed the biggest need for improvement across the grade levels. Both language arts and math demonstrated a need for improvement with students who are proficient, especially comparing to surrounding schools with similar demographics. While math BQ did show marked growth, there is still a need for improvement with BQ.

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

Contributing factors include the inconsistency with instructional staff and turn over during the 2021 school year. In fifth grade, the turnover created situations where educational settings were inconsistent and would impact student growth. The school did not have common grade level planning nor instructional coaches. In order to address this, the school needs a culture shift. Common planning time for all grade levels should be created and supported with the use of instructional coaches both in reading, math, and science.

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

Kindergarten in both reading and math showed the most growth in primary based on progress monitoring data. 4th grade students showed the largest increase in percent proficiency on state assessment. Learning gains and BQ growth increased in almost all grade levels for each subject area.

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

Team level planning and small group intervention.

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

Teachers will be needed to provided with time to internalize standards, understanding all facets of the standard as well as how it is most adequately assessed in a classroom setting. Students will need to be provided with appropriate and rigorous scaffolding so teachers do not retreat into prior-grade standards.

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 participate in BEST standards planning sessions weekly. . Monthly mini-professional development sessions will be held in order to support student and teacher need.

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

Through the use of coaching cycles, coaches, TTDs, and administrators will build teacher leadership. Through the use of common discourse and engagement strategies we will also build student capacity that can be carried into the following school year.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The percentage of students who demonstrate on grade level proficiency across the board is low, especially compared to local schools with similar demographics. All reporting categories for FSA were below the county average as well in ELA, math, and science for proficiency, learning gains, and BQ. 2022 FSA percentages of students demonstrating on grade level proficiency with a score of 3 or higher: ELA: 42% (-3%), Math: 42% (-2%), Science: 30% (-15%). FSA Gains percentages: ELA: 52% (+1%), Math: 46% (+5%). BQ percentages: ELA: 39% (-2%), Math 32% (+14%). I-Ready Progress Monitoring (mid or above grade level at end of school year): K- ELA 60%, Math 55% 1- ELA 38%, Math 29% 2- ELA 39%, Math 33% Considering progress monitoring data as well, the percentage of students that perform on or above grade level are lower than 50% in all grade levels and subjects, except 4th grade math students (55%) on FSA and kindergarten level students. Walkthrough data and informal/ formal observation data trends demonstrated that learning tasks did not always meet grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	In the 2022-2023 school year, 50% or more of 3rd-5th students will perform at grade level expectations on the ELA and Math FAST assessments. In the 2022-2023 school year, 50% or more of K-2nd students will perform at grade level expectations on the ELA and Math STAR assessments.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Leadership Team will conduct weekly walk throughs in the classrooms to observe whole group and small group instruction. The team will sort the data from the walk throughs to determine any areas of support. Student data from all assessments will be sorted to determine the percentage of students who are proficient in science and the percentage of students making gains in both reading, science and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alan Black (alan.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Common weekly planning with grade level teams will be utilized to increase teacher clarity of grade-level appropriate tasks aligned to the benchmarks. Planning for small group instruction with clear objectives, grade-level appropriate tasks, and appropriate strategies will be a focus during planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based planning will be used to ensure that students are being taught to the grade-level benchmarks, which will increase the number of students reaching proficiency in each grade level.

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.

Beginning in September 2022, weekly planning will be implemented by each grade-level team with a goal of two hours of planning per week. Third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers will be given a designated morning planning time once per week to provide a common planning time. All teachers can meet after school on Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, or Fridays to plan. Weekly planning will continue until the end of the school year.

Person Responsible   Alan Black (alan.black@hcps.net)

Extended Learning will be provided to students identified in Tier 2 and Tier 3 to address critical skill gaps and provide additional time with grade level standards in ELA, Math, and Science.

Person Responsible   Destony Cook (destony.cook@hcps.net)

Ongoing progress monitoring data will be reviewed and discussed during bi-monthly PLC meetings focusing on general classroom trends as well as ESSE groups.

Person Responsible   Destony Cook (destony.cook@hcps.net)

Reading coach and TTDs will provide planning support during morning and afternoon planning sessions.

Person Responsible   Alan Black (alan.black@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The percentage of students who demonstrate on grade level proficiency across the board is low, especially compared to local schools with similar demographics. All reporting categories for FSA were below the county average as well in ELA, math, and science for proficiency, learning gains, and BQ. 2022 FSA percentages of students demonstrating on grade level proficiency with a score of 3 or higher: ELA: 42% (-3%), Math: 42% (-2%), Science: 30% (-15%). FSA Gains percentages: ELA: 52% (+1%), Math: 46% (+5%). BQ percentages: ELA: 39% (-2%), Math 32% (+14%). I-Ready Progress Monitoring (mid or above grade level at end of school year): K- ELA 60%, Math 55% 1- ELA 38%, Math 29% 2- ELA 39%, Math 33% Considering progress monitoring data as well, the percentage of students that perform on or above grade level are lower than 50% in all grade levels and subjects, except 4th grade math students (55%) on FSA and kindergarten level students. Walkthrough data and informal/ formal observation data trends demonstrated that while teachers had plans for summative assessments, lessons would benefit from clear and well planned formative assessment strategies utilized throughout a lesson to gauge student learning and adjust instruction as needed.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	In the 2022-2023 school year, 50% or more of 3rd-5th students will perform at grade level expectations on the ELA and Math FAST assessments. In the 2022-2023 school year, 50% or more of K-2nd students will perform at grade level expectations on the ELA and Math STAR assessments.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The administrative team will observe monthly reports from all sources to determine student's progress. The administrative team will conduct walk-through to gather and analyze data as it relates to student engagement. Administration will attend common planning to endure grade level appropriate standards are embedded in the planned lessons.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alan Black (alan.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will actively progress monitor for student progress toward mastery of BEST standards during daily instruction. Formative assessments strategies will be planned during grade level common lesson planning time.

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

Frequent progress monitoring will allow teachers assess student progress and the needs of their students during each lesson. This data can be used to make adjustments to learning in the moment and for future lessons as well as determine demonstrate mastery of a standard.

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.

Teachers will plan daily progress monitoring (ex: standards-based exit tickets, checks for understanding, etc.) to analyze effectiveness of instruction and identify student gaps in learning. This will occur ongoing throughout the school year.

Person Responsible   Alan Black (alan.black@hcps.net)

Formal data chats with administration, content coaches and teachers will occur quarterly to monitor student's progress and to make adjustments to the students instructional path.

Person Responsible   Alan Black (alan.black@hcps.net)

Data will be reviewed and discussed during bi-monthly PLC meetings focusing on general classroom trends as well as ESSE groups.

Person Responsible   Destony Cook (destony.cook@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The percentage of students who demonstrate on grade level proficiency across the board is low, especially compared to local schools with similar demographics.
I-Ready Progress Monitoring (early on grade level or below grade level):
K- ELA 40%
1- ELA 62%
2- ELA 61%
Considering progress monitoring data as well, the percentage of students that perform on or above grade level are lower than 50% in all grade levels, except kindergarten level students.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The percentage of students who demonstrate on grade level proficiency across the board is low, especially compared to local schools with similar demographics. All reporting categories for FSA were below the county average as well in ELA for proficiency, learning gains, and BQ. 2022 FSA percentages of students demonstrating on grade level proficiency with a score of 3 or higher: ELA: 42% (-3%), FSA Gains percentages: ELA: 52% (+1%), BQ percentages: ELA: 39% (-2%). Considering individual grade levels, 61% of 3rd grade, 56% of 4th grade, and 57% of 5th grade students scored below a level 3 (on grade level) on the FSA.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

In the 2022-2023 school year, 50% or more of K-2nd students will perform at grade level expectations on the ELA and Math STAR assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In the 2022-2023 school year, 50% or more of 3rd-5th students will perform at grade level expectations on the ELA and Math FAST assessments.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The Leadership Team will conduct weekly walk throughs in the classrooms to observe whole group and small group instruction. The team will sort the data from the walk throughs to determine any areas of support. Student data from all assessments will be sorted to determine the percentage of students who are proficient in science and the percentage of students making gains in reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Black, Alan, alan.black@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

  ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teachers and students will utilize I-Ready to provide individualized instruction during small group and independent work times. Diagnostics will be given for progress monitoring and adjusting instructional priorities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

  ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

I-Ready will provide individualized instruction to students on their level weekly after the placement level is determined using progress monitoring diagnostics. Teachers will also use I-Ready lessons during small group to address specific areas of needs for small groups of students. Progress monitoring diagnostic data

will be analyzed to determine growth of students and target instructional needs for the class and small groups of students.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Diagnostic data will be analyzed during PLCs and grade level planning utilizing the literacy coach. Instructional priorities will be determined based on data.	Cook, Destony, destony.cook@hcps.net
Small group lessons using data and I-Ready toolkit will be planned during weekly planning session.	Black, Alan, alan.black@hcps.net
Literacy coach will conduct coaching cycles with teachers to model planning and instructing small group lessons using data and I-Ready lesson.	Black, Alan, alan.black@hcps.net

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.

Belmont will continue to engage in building a positive school culture . Parents will be provided a platform on classroom activities, programs, events and school practices. All stakeholders will be invited to attend and participate in school meetings such as SAC, PTA and Academic Parent nights.

Students and staff members will be recognized for their accomplishments including responsibility, leadership, and service. All stakeholders will be invited to participate in the celebrations.

The administrative team will review, analyze and discuss the end of the year survey to determine areas of

strengths and areas of opportunity. The data will be shared with teachers with embedded opportunities for questions and discussions. A plan will be developed with all staff members to improve the weaker areas.

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

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

Alan Black/Principal- The principal/APEI creates a positive school culture by engaging in school activities, providing time for professional development, recognizing stakeholders for the contributions, setting high expectations for students and staff, and believing that everyone can succeed. Additionally, the administration team creates a sense of belonging and provides a clear direction for students, teachers, parents and the community.

Destony Cook/APEI- Same as the principal- She also communicates weekly through a wide array of platforms for parents.

Lauren Rhinehart and Jois McConnell-Guidance Counselors/Michelle Cruz-Social Worker- Supports families to ensure success in school. They provide resources to the families and students as necessary.

Teachers- Provide many different opportunities for students to learn and the belief that all students can and will be successful