

Marion County Public Schools

Bellevue Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Belleview Elementary School

5556 SE COUNTY HIGHWAY 484, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Belleview Elementary School will provide a quality learning environment where students will learn and become responsible, self-sufficient citizens who will be willing and able to become contributing members of our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Helping all students succeed.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Thomas, Victoria	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and provide successful high-quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Supervises all administrative, instructional, and non-Instructional personnel assigned to the school.
Helfrey, Edward	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies. The assistant principal further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, with monitoring the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation. He will assist with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specific areas.
Clifford, Marty	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment for students and staff. In addition, work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.
Flood, Trudy	Math Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and para professionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning in the area of Mathematics. The Content Area serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on mathematical needs. The coach teaches and remediates targeted students based on data.
Forst, Bethany	Reading Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and para professionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning in the area of English/Language Arts. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on needs in ELA. The coach teaches and remediates targeted students based on data.
Earnest, Wendy	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach serves as an academic coach for teachers and para professionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning in the area of English/Language Arts. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on needs in ELA. The instructional coach teaches and remediates targeted students based on data.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The development of the SIP goals was in partnership with the leadership team and staff. Data was shared and disaggregated to determine the areas of greatest need of students and school. Trends were uncovered and discussed. Then possible solutions to meet the needs and increase student achievement were developed.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored for effective implementation after the F.A.S.T. Assessments AP1, AP2, and AP3 F.A.S.T. windows. Data for those students in the bottom quartile and those scoring in the non-proficient range will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the plan. Instructional decisions will be revised as needed in order to ensure continuous improvement for students to increase proficiency levels.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C

	2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	19	52	52	45	45	43	0	0	0	256	
One or more suspensions	5	11	6	15	6	8	0	0	0	51	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	6	26	27	29	5	2	0	0	0	95	
Course failure in Math	8	14	15	25	24	5	0	0	0	91	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	21	19	0	0	0	102	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	59	19	18	0	0	0	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	26	95	35	42	0	0	0	198	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	16	38	39	42	42	0	0	0	0	177

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	34	28	38	48	32	34	0	0	0	214	
One or more suspensions	9	5	7	8	9	18	0	0	0	56	
Course failure in ELA	12	41	40	61	12	53	0	0	0	219	
Course failure in Math	8	30	24	47	29	23	0	0	0	161	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	15	28	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	44	18	34	0	0	0	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	15	32	33	51	23	43	0	0	0	197

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	27	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	34	28	38	48	32	34	0	0	0	214	
One or more suspensions	9	5	7	8	9	18	0	0	0	56	
Course failure in ELA	12	41	40	61	12	53	0	0	0	219	
Course failure in Math	8	30	24	47	29	23	0	0	0	161	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	15	28	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	44	18	34	0	0	0	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	15	32	33	51	23	43	0	0	0	197

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	27	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47			49	47	56	46		
ELA Learning Gains				62	56	61	43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62	51	52	67		
Math Achievement*	53			50	54	60	51		
Math Learning Gains				54	62	64	49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43	52	55	64		
Science Achievement*	49			30	42	51	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	68			42			71		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	256
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	4	4
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	3	2
HSP	45			
MUL	45			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	54			
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	3
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	2	1
HSP	50			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	47			53			49					68
SWD	22			33			45				4	
ELL	24			38			27				5	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			29							3	
HSP	42			47			28				5	65

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	45			62							3	
PAC												
WHT	53			58			66				4	
FRL	44			48			48				5	70

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	49	62	62	50	54	43	30					42
SWD	21	60		26	33	27	7					
ELL	37	67		48	58							42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	17		13	31							
HSP	43	66	75	48	52	38	36					42
MUL	45	55		70	55							
PAC												
WHT	57	67	60	54	58	52	30					
FRL	45	63	64	45	52	43	30					38

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	43	67	51	49	64	29					71
SWD	31	53		31	59		31					
ELL	38			35								71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			32								
HSP	47	44		51	47		19					74
MUL	55			60								
PAC												
WHT	48	41	69	53	46	58	28					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	41	38	64	49	43	59	23					67

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	48%	18%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	35%	39%	-4%	50%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	53%	8%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	55%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	43%	5%	51%	-3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Third Grade ELA proficiency was the school's lowest data component. Several factors contributed in this performance. One contributing factor was that students entering third grade achieved a proficiency of 17% based on the F.A.S.T. PM 1, thus indicating that students were not ready to access third grade content. Another contributing factor was the lack of explicit and systematic instruction in the areas of phonics and decoding, thus leaving students not able to independently read grade level text. 50% of our third grade ELA teachers were new to teaching and/or grade level.

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

Third grade ELA showed the greatest decline from 46% proficiency to 35% proficiency. Several factors contributed in this performance. One contributing factor was that students entering third grade achieved a proficiency of 17% based on the F.A.S.T. PM 1, thus indicating that students were not ready to access third grade content. Another contributing factor was the lack of explicit and systematic instruction in the areas of phonics and decoding, thus leaving students not able to independently read grade level text. 50% of our third grade ELA teachers were new to teaching and/or grade level.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The component that had the greatest gap was 3rd grade ELA. There was a 15% gap between our 3rd grade ELA proficiency, 35%, compared to the state average of 50%. Several factors contributed in this performance. One contributing factor was that students entering third grade achieved a proficiency of 17% based on the F.A.S.T. PM 1, thus indicating that students were not ready to access third grade content. Another contributing factor was the lack of explicit and systematic instruction in the areas of phonics and decoding, thus leaving students not able to independently read grade level text. 50% of our third grade ELA teachers were new to teaching and/or grade level.

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

Our 4th Grade ELA proficiency of 66% showed the greatest gain of all components. There was a 13% achievement gain from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023. New actions taken to achieve this gain included: having students read and write critically as well as annotating text using close reading strategies. We also incorporated frequent, purposeful, small group talk surrounding text.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern based on the EWS is students scoring a level one on the ELA FAST Assessment. This shows that students are not achieving grade-level expectations and therefore are working below grade level. Additionally, students with chronic absences are of great concern. Student with chronic attendance concerns contribute to the number of nonproficient students.

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

2nd and 3rd grade ELA proficiency, learning gains in 4th and 5th grade ELA and Math, African American and Students with Disabilities (proficiency in ELA and Math).

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Belleview's Black/African-American subgroup was identified as a crucial need due to the subgroup's Federal Percentage of Points Index fell below 41% for two consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through a mentoring program, Black/African American student proficiency will increase by 10%, from 21% to 31%.

Monitoring:

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

The Black/African-American subgroup of student data will be monitored after each administration of the FAST Assessment to determine if students in this subgroup in progressing toward the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Black-African American students will participate in a mentoring program. Each student will be partnered with a mentor from staff. Mentors will build positive relationships with students to included academic and emotional support. Mentors will meet regularly with students to discuss and review students' class and assessment data, as well as student interest. Additionally, mentors will communicate with students' teachers for further support the student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that if we provide Black/African American students with mentors, the mentorship will create a positive impact in the students' academic and social situations. The mentorship will teach students how to be invested in school, their future and helps hold them accountable.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Identify Black/African American students and assign mentors. Mentors from all staff positions as well as from volunteers will mentor these students. Meetings will be scheduled to ensure that students and mentors meet on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Students will be assigned a mentor by September 15, 2023. Mentoring will begin the following week and continue through the 23-24 school year.

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Belleview's Students with Disabilities subgroup was identified as a crucial need due to the subgroup's Federal Percentage of Points Index fell below 41% for three consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through strategic vetted interventions targeting specific deficiencies to fill the gap in order to access Tier 1 instruction, Students with Disabilities proficiency will increase by 5%, from 29% to 34%.

Monitoring:

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

Students with Disabilities data will be monitored through the 40-minute intervention block. Data will be collected from frequent intervention progress monitoring assessments to determine if students are closing the gap in their specific deficiencies. Monitoring will take place through Coach and Administrative walk-throughs and frequent intervention notebook checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Edward Helfrey (edward.helfrey@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students with disabilities will be screened into UFLI Foundations, SIPPS, or Lexia Core interventions. These interventions are designed to help students that lack phonics skills that enable them to decode words thus hindering their inability access grade level text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students with disabilities spend quality time in a vetted phonics program to increase their decoding strategies, then reading fluency and comprehension will improve so that students are able to access grade level text.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

The ESE/Inclusion teachers will be trained and coached in UFLI, SIPPS, and Lexia Core to provide additional phonemic and phonics lessons to SWD.

Person Responsible: Bethany Forst (bethany.forst@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: ESE/Inclusion teachers will be trained by August 3, 2023.

Based on response to interventions, SWD will be provided additional phonics lesson with the ESE/ Inclusion teacher.

Person Responsible: Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Every four to six weeks, intervention data will be reviewed to determine those SWD needing additional lessons.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teacher Retention and Recruitment is identified as a crucial need for Belleview Elementary School. More than a quarter of classroom teachers left the school by the end of the 22-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Belleview Elementary's retention of current classroom teachers will decrease from 26% to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will take place based on the number of teachers choosing to remain at Belleview Elementary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

New career teachers and those new to Belleview will go through Belleview's Teacher Coaching and Induction Program. The program will be completed throughout the year. Once a month the academic coaches and administration will meet with these teachers. Meetings will consist of, but not limited to, navigating the first few days and weeks of school, professional learning on instructional strategies, effective classroom management strategies, data analysis to inform instruction, etc. Teachers will receive be placed on coaching cycles. They will also be partnered with a teacher in their grade level that will assist with the day-to-day operations of Belleview and offer suggestions as needed to help the new teacher get acclimated

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie found that when instructional coaching has an effect size of .51 and conducted over-time in conjunction with data analysis to inform instruction, student growth is impacted.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Identify teachers needing Coaching and Induction Program

Person Responsible: Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Initial teachers will be identified by August 21, 2023. Additional teachers may be identified through classroom observations as needed.

Monthly meeting agendas will be planned and scheduled. Agendas will include, but not limited to the following topics: FEAPS, instructional strategies, data analysis, classroom management strategies, lesson planning, communicating with families, etc.

Person Responsible: Edward Helfrey (edward.helfrey@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Meeting dates will be established by August 10, 2023. They will be listed on the school's master calendar. Monthly agendas are planned as needs arise.

Instructional coaches will be assigned to provide coaching and support for all teachers. Coaches will model and provide side-by-side coaching with participants.

Person Responsible: Edward Helfrey (edward.helfrey@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: By August 21, 2023, initial coaching cycles will be scheduled. The frequency of the coaching sessions will continue based on teacher need and student data.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During data disaggregation, we have identified a need to improve instructional practices through Tier 1 instruction. As well as improve the development of teacher Think Alouds. Proficiency based on the 2023 FAST Assessment are: 3rd Grade decreased from 43% to 35%; 4th grade remained the same at 66%, while 5th grade increased from 42% to 49%. 49% of students in grades 3-5 remain non-proficient in the areas of ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we provide teachers with supported collaboration opportunities focused on developing high-yield instructional strategies during Tier 1 instruction, develop/choose productive and purposeful formative assessments and student activities that are aligned to the depth and complexity of the benchmarks and develop purposeful Think Alouds, the proficiency will increase.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will take place using data from the following: Administrative and CAS walkthroughs, 3-5 District DPMA Assessments, FAST AP1, AP2 & AP3 assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Forst (bethany.forst@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All teachers will participate in in-depth, intentional and purposeful student-centered collaborative planning with grade and subject area peers focused on Think Alouds, choosing instructional strategies, activities which provide data that students demonstrate the knowledge needed to master benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies, "Teachers that participate in effective and intentional planning has the potential to accelerate student achievement with an effect size of .76.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

One day of ELA and one day of Math collaboration will be scheduled and attended by all teachers each week.

Person Responsible: Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Scheduling of collaboration for the school year will be added to the master calendar by August 10th. Teacher weekly attendance is on-going throughout the school year.

During collaboration teachers will develop and agree upon a common Check for Understanding or other formative check and review data gathered. Based on data, teachers will determine next steps: Reteaching, review, etc. Teachers will also plan a bank of high-yield instructional strategies in which to choose from during instruction.

Person Responsible: Bethany Forst (bethany.forst@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: On-going throughout school year.

Reading and Math CAS will provide coaching, modeling, and data analysis support to effectively develop and implement benchmark-based Tier 1 instruction for whole group and reteaching or remediation strategies for individual student needs.

Person Responsible: Trudy Flood (trudy.flood@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: On-going throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School improvement funding allocation will be presented to the SAC committee to review to ensure that funds are being allocated to meet the needs of the SIP. During this review funds may be relocated based on data reviewed quarterly.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Only 45% of students in K-3 are on or above grade level according to I-ready diagnostic data.

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

49% of our students in grades 3-5 are non-proficient in ELA based on the F.A.S.T PM 3 Assessment, with only 35% proficiency in third grade and 49% proficiency in fifth grade.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

If we provide teachers with professional develop focused on the proper implementation of UFLI Foundations which is an explicit and systematic phonics program, then reading proficiency will increase from 38% to 48% in first grade and from 45% to 55% in second grade.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we provide teachers with professional development focused on developing high yield instructional strategies during Tier I instruction, develop/choose productive and purposeful formal assessments and student activities that are vetted and aligned to the depth and complexity of the benchmark, then reading proficiency will increase from 35% to 45% in third grade and will increase from 49% to 55% in fifth grade.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitoring will take place using data from the following:

- *K-2 STAR Assessment AP1, AP2 and AP3 data
- *3rd --iReady Diagnostic Assessment in August, December and May
- *3-5 FAST Assessment AP1, AP2, and AP3 data
- *3-5 District Progress Monitoring Assessment in October and February
- *3-5 District Demand Writing Assessment

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Thomas, Victoria, victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

The evidenced-based program used in grades K-2 is UFLI Foundations. This is an explicit and systematic phonics program that builds students' phonics and foundational reading skills from kindergarten to 2nd grade. SIPPS may also be used to support students who struggle with phonics, while Lexia Core will be used to support those students needing vocabulary and comprehension support.

Students in grade third and fifth will also use the SIPPS program to support those students still requiring phonics instruction. Third graders needing vocabulary and comprehension support will be placed in Lexia Core. Students in fifth grade will be placed into Read 180 to support their vocabulary and comprehension deficits as needed.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The UFLI Foundations program follows a scope and sequence designed to ensure that students systematically acquire each skill needed and learn to apply with automaticity and confidence.

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
1. One action step is professional learning will be provided to instructional staff to build capacity in the use of proper implementation of each step in a daily lesson. Coaches will also model the proper implementation of an entire daily UFLI lesson.	Forst, Bethany, bethany.forst@marion.k12.fl.us
Provide professional learning for teachers in third through fifth grade to build capacity in using and implementing instructional strategies that provide higher effect sizes that align to the depth of the benchmark. Teachers will also plan student activities and use resources aligned to the depth of the standard.	Helfrey, Edward, edward.helfrey@marion.k12.fl.us
The LLT will identify students that are not progressing towards proficiency at each monitoring checkpoint and recommend additional learning opportunities for students such as, additional individual and small group instruction.	Earnest, Wendy, wendy.earnest@marion.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School improvement plan will be presented to all staff members during a faculty meeting. It will be presented to the SAC when approved. Data will be reviewed quarterly and shared with staff during data dig collaboration meetings. Data will also be presented to the SAC at its' quarterly meetings. Data will be analyzed to determine if we are on the trajectory to meet the goals outlined in the SIP. The School Improvement plan will be posted to the school's website: <https://www.marionschools.net/bve>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will provide opportunities for parents, families, and other community stakeholders to participate in quarterly events that will build positive relationships and assist in fulfilling the school's mission to support the needs of our students. Parents families and other community stakeholders will have opportunities to make suggestions and provide feedback about the program currently being utilized at the school through parent surveys that are distributed during events and through SAC. The Parent and Family Engagement Plan will be posted to the school's website: <https://www.marionschools.net/bve>.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Belleview's area of focus for the 2023-24 school year is providing teachers with supported collaboration focusing on Tier 1 instruction through the use of scripted, benchmark-based lesson plans in ELA and Math with an emphasis on what teacher and students will do and say during the lesson (Teacher Think Alouds). By improving the delivery of Tier 1 instruction that is aligned to the benchmarks, the amount of students in ELA and Math proficiency will increase. The scripted lessons have specific time frames embedded in them to assist teachers with the pacing of the lesson, thus increasing the amount of quality instruction by decreasing the amount of off-task behavior which leads to classroom interruptions and misuse of valuable instructional time. Additionally, our Master Schedule and classroom assignments have been developed to increase instructional time by decreasing excess transitions and movements. Grade levels now have a common MTSS time; which allows us to maximize resources and decreases the number of students with phonological deficits in a group. The group sizes will allow teachers to hone in on specific areas of deficits for their specific MTSS group.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A