

Hernando County School District

Explorer K 8



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Explorer K 8

10252 NORTHCLIFFE BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34608

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ek8>

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Braithwaite

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Hernando 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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Explorer K 8

10252 NORTHCLIFFE BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34608

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ek8>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

All stakeholders in our community will work collaboratively to promote an environment of high expectations where all of our young explorers will have the opportunity to receive a quality, interactive education in a nurturing, safe and secure environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Explore today....Conquer tomorrow!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Braithwaite, Lisa	Principal	Oversees the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Fischer, Jocelyn	Teacher, K-12	Title I ELA Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Weed, Donald	Administrative Support	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity. Also monitors and implements the PBIS system.
MacGregor, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Roman, Jillian	Administrative Support	Assessment teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting all grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and reporting state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data for continuous monitoring of students achievement.
Jackson, Susan	Administrative Support	Title 1 Facilitator monitors the purchases made are tied to the areas of need based on the data. The coordination of family engagement activities and ensures that Federal Compliance is being met.
Kling, Marguerite	Teacher, K-12	Title I Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of ELA and Reading data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Rivera, Susan	Administrative Support	Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of MTSS data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Anderson, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Title1 Math Resource Teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for monitoring and guiding math instruction with an intense focus on grades 3 through 5. Also is in charge of the Mentoring Program for "New to Teaching Teachers" and "New to Explorer Teachers" to insure district and school wide procedures are followed.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schwartz, Eric	Assistant Principal	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Schlechter, Magen		
Washington, Terri	Administrative Support	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity. Also monitors and implements the PBIS system.
Cuevas, Toni	Instructional Coach	Supports teachers by delivering Professional Development, providing resources, and engaging in the Coaching Cycle to assist teachers in providing rigorous and standards based instruction to students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Lisa Braithwaite

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

43

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

64

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

125

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	166	194	150	206	157	180	205	203	191	0	0	0	0	1652
Attendance below 90 percent	20	15	11	18	15	22	24	21	26	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	12	5	18	7	14	33	50	37	48	0	0	0	0	224
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	4	0	19	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	32	42	70	70	44	0	0	0	0	275

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	47	25	46	47	56	92	120	95	116	0	0	0	0	644

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	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	166	194	150	206	157	180	205	203	191	0	0	0	0	1652
Attendance below 90 percent	20	15	11	18	15	22	24	21	26	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	12	5	18	7	14	33	50	37	48	0	0	0	0	224
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	4	0	19	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	32	42	70	70	44	0	0	0	0	275

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	47	25	46	47	56	92	120	95	116	0	0	0	0	644

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	47%	70%	61%	48%	64%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	61%	59%	49%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	54%	43%	48%	51%
Math Achievement	49%	70%	62%	55%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%	58%	59%	57%	63%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	58%	52%	59%	60%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	60%	56%	44%	59%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	83%	78%	63%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	57%	-3%	58%	-4%
	2018	69%	62%	7%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	59%	-2%	58%	-1%
	2018	42%	53%	-11%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	37%	52%	-15%	56%	-19%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	44%	52%	-8%	54%	-10%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	50%	53%	-3%	52%	-2%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	51%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	38%	53%	-15%	56%	-18%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
	2018	69%	67%	2%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	62%	-8%	64%	-10%
	2018	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	60%	-15%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	61%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	42%	53%	-11%	55%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	61%	62%	-1%	54%	7%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
08	2019	17%	50%	-33%	46%	-29%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	45%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-43%				
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	46%	54%	-8%	48%	-2%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	50%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	67%	19%	67%	19%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	75%	1%	71%	5%
2018	67%	74%	-7%	71%	-4%
Compare		9%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	59%	13%	61%	11%
2018	88%	62%	26%	62%	26%
Compare		-16%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	45%	-45%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	40	38	23	44	42	14	60			
ELL	24	39	50	29	54	56	30	64			
ASN	67	54		73	62						
BLK	38	50	55	40	46	35	38	73			
HSP	41	50	44	41	48	49	41	74	48		
MUL	34	51	57	31	52	73	53	67			
WHT	53	52	52	56	50	53	55	81	41		
FRL	44	50	50	45	47	50	44	73	38		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	31	26	27	50	48	37	19			
ELL	10	45	48	31	55	68	17				
ASN	67	70		73	60						
BLK	40	21	23	39	41	46	26	55			
HSP	43	42	36	49	50	61	43	62	59		
MUL	49	47		45	54	50	53	64			
WHT	51	45	38	59	52	53	56	73	32		
FRL	44	40	37	51	48	53	48	63	36		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	9	40	42	14	46	50	18	24			
ELL	18	44	54	34	58	50	27				
ASN	60	38		73	69						
BLK	41	49	35	41	52	52	42	58			
HSP	39	45	42	51	59	57	30	62	29		
MUL	43	47	38	39	44	58	33				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
WHT	53	51	47	60	57	61	51	65	47		
FRL	45	48	43	53	56	60	39	61	35		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	47
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	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
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	52
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	52
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	55
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Explorer K-8's lowest performing data component was Middle School Math Acceleration demonstrating 42% of available points earned. The contributing factors include targeted focus from resource teachers and district coach on Intensive Math courses instead of core classes and Algebra I.

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

Explorer K-8's greatest decline from the prior year was evident in Math Achievement, dropping from 54% to 49% of available points earned. The contributing factors include a targeted focus from resource teachers and district coach as they pushed in to Intensive Math courses instead of core classes. Intensive Math courses were using an i-Ready model for the first time, and additional training may have been needed to support ALL math teachers in differentiating instruction.

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.

Explorer K-8's greatest gap from the state average occurred in the 8 grade Math component, measuring 29% points below the state average according to available data. The factors that contributed to this gap included a need for teacher training in differentiating instruction, and additional support in pacing and rigor from resource teachers and district coaches.

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

Explorer K-8's greatest improvement was in the area of ELA Bottom Quartile, earning 15% more points than the prior year increasing from 35% to 50% of points earned and meeting our 2018-2019 School Improvement Plan Goal. Explorer K-8 implemented focused data chats regarding our school's ELA Bottom Quartile during PLCs and professional days. Title I resource teachers pushed in to classrooms to provide focused assistance during differentiated instruction and bottom quartile student groups were formed, meeting with resource teachers for additional instruction throughout the day.

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

Attendance below 90% - Because students have not been in school since March 13, 2020 due to the Covid 19 pandemic, Explorer K-8 administration and staff anticipate challenges in this area as students return to school or participate in the digital home learning option. Staff will closely monitor student attendance in face-to-face and digital classes in order to address concerns early.

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

1. Bottom Quartile In Math
2. Bottom Quartile in Reading
3. Students with Disabilities
4. Middle School English Language Learners

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student-Centered Decision Making
Math achievement dropped from 54% of students meeting proficiency to 49% from 2017-2018. Additionally, Explorer's learning gains in Math decreased from 51% to 49% showing growth. Finally, the students in the lowest 25% in Math demonstrating learning gains dropped from 54% to 50%. The ESSA federal index for students with disabilities was 35%, missing the target of 41%.

Measurable Outcome: Explorer K-8 will increase the percentage of students demonstrating learning gains in Math by at least 5 percentage points in the 2020-2021 school year. The number of students with disabilities scoring proficient will increase from 35% to 41% as indicated by the ESSA Federal Index.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Explorer K-8 will make student-centered decisions by supporting bottom quartile students in grades 4-8 with alternative instructional strategies and resources, additional resource teachers, strategic push-in and pull-out schedules, and collaboration among teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explorer K-8 experienced success using these strategies resulting in a 15% increase in students making learning gains in ELA in 2018-2019. These strategies included supporting bottom quartile students in grades 4-8 with alternative instructional strategies, additional resource teachers, developing strategic push-in and pull-out schedules, and collaborating among teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase the number of Math Resource Personnel
2. Strategically place students in Intensive Math courses based on prior FSA and current i-Ready data
3. Seek support for core classes from Middle School District Math Coach

Person Responsible Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

4. Identify the students who need remediation and/or targeted instruction
5. Review FSA and i-Ready data to look for trends within strands using the I Notice, I Wonder protocol
- 6 Develop push-in and pull-out schedules to meet the needs of students who have not made learning gains and are in the lowest 25%

Person Responsible Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

7. Systematically monitor student outcomes by analyzing progress monitoring data
8. Formulate an action plan using the Data Reflection Journal Template, administrative walkthroughs, and Resource Teacher Observations.

Person Responsible Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

- 9, Seek and provide training opportunities for teachers to improve classroom instruction

Person Responsible Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In the 2018-2019 school year, Explorer K-8 increased the grade level proficiency in ELA of the bottom quartile students from 35% to 50% proficient. This 15% gain was due to supporting those bottom quartile students in grades 4-8 with alternative instructional strategies and resources, additional resource teachers, strategic push-in and pull-out schedules, and collaboration among teachers.

Measurable Outcome: Explorer K-8 would like to maintain the 50% proficient among the ELA bottom quartile, with an increased awareness of how our students with disabilities are performing. EK8's goal for our students with disabilities in ELA would be to show 41% proficiency, an increase of 6% from our current score of 35% proficient.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will discuss students with disability data as a part of their team Student Work Analysis Protocol process. Teachers will then collaborate to set goals for the SWD and discuss alternative strategies as a part of the team SWAP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When teachers are actively focusing on the data collection around the SWD subgroup of students, they will become more aware of the student growth or stagnation. If teachers are provided with opportunities to report this SWD data and collaborate on strategies that move students toward growth, instructional effectiveness and student scores will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Add a section to the Student Work Analysis Protocol document which specifically asks teachers to report to their teams indicating how their SWD's are performing in relation to the rest of the class.
2. Teachers will add this discussion to their team meetings when analyzing student work.
3. The assessment teacher will collect SWAP data to share with teams.
4. Teams will celebrate student growth.

Person Responsible: Jillian Roman (roman_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance will be closely monitored by administration so as to address potential truancy issues early.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Explorer K-8 is a Title I school and works hard to foster positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. Regular print and digital communication includes automated calls, flyers and backpack notices and our website. We also use Facebook to inform our community about school activities, achievements and initiatives and invite community feedback. Explorer K-8 also convenes monthly School Advisory Council and Title I Committee meetings to hear stakeholder input relevant to school improvement and parent concerns. Explorer K-8 also convenes a Title I Annual Meeting, host parent conferences throughout the year, and foster parental engagement through parent workshops such as grade level curriculum nights and STEAM Night.

From the beginning of school Explorer K-8 begins to develop positive relationships and open communication between parents and teachers. School communication folders and agendas are used daily to communicate academic and behavioral progress daily.

.Community partners are invited to larger parent events to increase school community awareness of community service providers and provide families with access to information and resources. Explorer K-8 establishes partnerships with businesses including our neighboring McDonalds, Winn Dixie, YMCA, as well as People Helping People and Operation HeartF.E.L.T Community stakeholders such as Operation HeartF.E.L.T and People Helping People provide weekend food backpacks to our students as well. weekend food backpack programs. Explorer Students interact with the community through Beta Club, Student Council, and community volunteer projects.

Parents also participate in the development and revision of the Title I Compact and Title I Parent and Family Engagement Plan. The plan is distributed to parents at the Title I Annual Meeting and sent home by backpack to parents who are not able to attend the Title I Annual Meeting. The Title I Compact encourages and sets expectations between students, parents, and teachers.

Explorer K-8 also foster a positive school climate for students as a PBIS school. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.