Foster Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
school improvement
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
ambitious
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
resources
areas of focus
instruction
supportive environment
growth
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Foster Elementary School

2014 E DIANA ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Antonio Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: F (30%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 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.

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

Foster Elementary School

2014 E DIANA ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	97%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	F	F	D	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.

Foster Elementary will provide a welcoming environment where stakeholders exchange ideas & strategies that will result in a rigorous, differentiated academic experience. Foster Elementary will promote stability through social emotional learning that will help build relationships across the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Foster is a community school that empowers all stakeholders to work together, creating lifelong learners.

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
Hayward, Kimberlee	Principal	Oversee all aspects of school including curriculum, instruction, student achievement and behavior management. Liaison between families, district and state personnel, faculty and staff. Responsible for facility maintenance, budgets, hiring, etc.
Quinlan, Brooke	Assistant Principal	Oversee all aspects of school including curriculum, instruction, student achievement and behavior management. Liaison between families, district and state personnel, faculty and staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/16/2020, Antonio Smith

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.*
1

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: F (30%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	64	70	54	45	76	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
Attendance below 90 percent	30	28	17	12	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	7	27	26	25	17	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	73	68	60	93	68	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	427
Attendance below 90 percent	19	15	8	25	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	2	0	6	11	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	2	21	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	73	68	60	93	68	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	427
Attendance below 90 percent	19	15	8	25	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	2	0	6	11	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	2	21	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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
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	24%	52%	57%	33%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	37%	55%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	50%	53%	59%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	22%	54%	63%	29%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	33%	57%	62%	39%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	46%	51%	39%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	50%	53%	22%	48%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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	13%	52%	-39%	58%	-45%	
	2018	25%	53%	-28%	57%	-32%	
Same Grade Comparison		-12%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	16%	55%	-39%	58%	-42%	
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	56%	-21%	
Same Grade Comparison		-19%					
Cohort Comparison		-9%					
05	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%	
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	55%	-22%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	15%	54%	-39%	62%	-47%	
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	62%	-27%	
Same Grade Comparison		-20%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	12%	57%	-45%	64%	-52%	
	2018	34%	57%	-23%	62%	-28%	
Same Grade Comparison		-22%					
Cohort Comparison		-23%					
05	2019	26%	54%	-28%	60%	-34%	
	2018	35%	54%	-19%	61%	-26%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	26%	51%	-25%	53%	-27%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	30%	52%	-22%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison						

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	27	30	16	22	33	25	37				
ELL	20	56		28	33						
BLK	18	34	31	18	30	30	29				
HSP	41	50		35	38		38				
WHT	46			38							
FRL	24	38	35	23	33	32	35				

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	30	30	23	19	21	21	45				
ELL	25	33		20	50						
BLK	31	43	29	29	41	38	33				
HSP	42	42		46	68		30				
WHT	64			71							
FRL	36	41	32	36	50	41	30				

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	16	38	30	10	25	23	7				
ELL	25	35		14	36						
BLK	30	52	61	28	43	38	21				
HSP	34	52		21	20		23				
WHT	54			54							
FRL	32	52	60	28	39	39	20				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	256
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	42
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	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

When looking at state FSA data as well as district testing for 19-20, Third grade ELA had lowest proficiency out of tested grades. Fifth grade Form 2 in mathematics was area of weakness in regards to proficiency and gains.

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

Using 19-20 school data from iReady, 5th grade math iReady proficiency decreased. The cohort of students in question had inconsistent core instruction during their 4th grade year with many students have multiple teachers.

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.

Looking at 18-19 school grade our largest gap from the district was math achievement.

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

Using data from the 19-20 district assessments. The area of science and reading gains showed the most improvement. For science, a targeted calendar aligned with the EL reading curriculum was created for cross-curricular instruction. In addition, 5th grade students attended hour long science specials to address curriculum missed during the 4th grade year. For reading, the school implemented the EL reading program. Our focus while implementing this program was on questioning and discussion aligned to the depth and rigor of the grade level standards.

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

While reviewing 18-19 school grade data as well as 19-20 District Testing data ELL students in 3rd & 4th grade made the least gains. Our students with disabilities, particularly in fourth grade, did not make adequate gains on FSA or across Reading Formatives.

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

1. Standards Based Remediation and Enrichment
2. Social Emotional Learning Practices
3. Higher Order Thinking Questions and Discussion
4. Small Group Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While reviewing recent data, the proficiency of students at Foster Elementary is significantly below the district average. In addition, students make gains at a far less rate than the district average despite a large percentage of students testing on a level 1 according to FSA. The ESSA subgroups Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Students on Free and Reduced Lunch and black students will benefit from the additional instruction as well as remediation. From this data, Foster leadership team members determined we would continue to improve our instructional alignment to Florida Standards.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students at Tier 1 according to iReady (EOY view) will increase 5% each diagnostic in both reading and math resulting in a 10% increase in proficiency over the 19-20 results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Foster will implement a Standard Based Remediation block that will be consistent within the grade level. This block will allow teachers to re-teach or enrich grade level standards taught in the core. The block will work on a 10-day cycle using Measure Up! and MAFS materials. Student work protocols coupled will drive the instructional calendars for this block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By carving out time in the schedule for additional work with grade level standards using supplemental research based materials we will increase our reading and math proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hold student Work Protocol with grade level team, administration, and math and reading coaches on a bi-weekly basis to look at data trends and determine which standards students did not master at the core level.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

2. During common planning, we will plan an instruction calendar that reflects results of Student Work Protocol and assign students to classroom teachers, math resource, reading coaches, and RTI Facilitators with a focus on best practices for instructing each standard.

Person Responsible	Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

3. Implement remediation of Standards using MAFS and Measure Up! curriculum based on calendar.

Person Responsible	Brooke Quinlan (brooke.quinlan@hcps.net)

4. Follow the problem solving process and check fidelity of implementation through walkthroughs and student assessments data. Use results of check process to engage in the next cycle of the problem solving process with an additional focus on the ESSA subgroups to determine if the block is helping bridge the gaps.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

5. Reward individual students for progress on mastery of standards on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible   Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

6. Using results of student work protocols and fidelity checks, professional development will be planned in order to address effectiveness of teaching grade level standard. Professional Development will occur quarterly starting in October.

Person Responsible   Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 19-20 school year, discipline referrals dropped by 35, a reduction of over 30%. However, during the 19-20 school year we had 56 referrals which included fighting, elopement and physical attack. Elopement was the result of one student so this data point will not be used for further planning.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 19-20 school year, discipline referrals in the area of fighting and physical attack will decrease by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continue implementation of the Ron Clark house system with alignment to Second Step Curriculum. Train teachers on social-emotional learning practices through book-studies and PLCs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 19-20 school year the Second Step and House Systems were implemented at Foster Elementary with moderate fidelity. During this time, discipline referrals reduced over 30%. Foster saw reductions in the percentage of students suspended in all quarters prior to the closure of brick and mortar school in Quarter 4.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Response to Intervention resource teachers will train staff on House System and Second-Step curriculum and participate in the book study "We Got This" by Cornelius Minor.

Person Responsible   Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

2. Social Service Team to include guidance, Response to Intervention resource teachers, mental health counselor and psychologist will create a Second Step calendar to ensure teachers appropriately pace themselves through the curriculum and align house lessons to key social skills taught in SEL lessons.

Person Responsible   Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

3. Response to Intervention and administration will complete fidelity walks to ensure that all teachers are appropriately implementing Second-Step lessons.

Person Responsible   Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

4. Review behavior tracker and referral data bi-weekly at leadership meetings and engage in the problem-solving process as necessary.

Person Responsible   Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

5. Hold House Celebrations to reward student behavior and decreases in behavior incidents.

Person Responsible   Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Despite tremendous growth in the areas of reading, math and science in the 19-20 school year, according to district data less than 50% of our students were slated to make gains in ELA and math according to school grade simulations based on district formative data.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 20-21 school year Foster's learning gains will be above 50% in all 4 gain categories.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During core instruction teachers will plan for and implement small group instruction using iReady LAFS and MAFS Materials, and Achieve 3000.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These materials were chosen to support our EL reading program as well as Envision math. Foster elementary saw learning gains at a lower rate than the district, so the support of small-group instruction on grade level standards using evidence-based materials will be critical in bridging gaps in achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will receive training on Achieve 3000 on iReady MAFS and LAFS.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

2. Math and Reading Coaches will help facilitate planning sessions focused on small-group instruction 2 times per week. Teachers will leave planning with materials and concepts that need to be covered for our students with the highest need.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

3. Teachers will participate in coaching cycles with Reading and Math Coaches based on trend data discussed in leadership meetings. When necessary, teachers will participate in side-by-side coaching with other teachers.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

4. Fidelity of small group instruction will be determined through regular walkthroughs by administration as well as student data which will be discussed during the bi-weekly Student Work Protocol PLC focusing on general classroom trends as well as ESSA subgroups.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The proficiency rates of the students at Foster Elementary are below the district average in all areas. The School Improvement Team determined that if student engagement increased, proficiency would increase as students would have more exposure to the grade level standards that is not teacher led. During Walkthroughs in February 2019, the ILT team collected data on student engagement. Overwhelmingly, the teacher was the one leading the learning in almost all classrooms. Due to this, the ILT determined that the quickest way to increase student engagement was to increase student talk.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency will increase 10% in all areas from 18-19 school grade data. This will be measured by increases in Tier 1 students according to iReady and Achieve 3000.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement Kagan structures during all areas of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The cooperative learning structure that Kagan Structures provide have an effect size of .40 according to John Hattie's visible learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will receive mini-professional development monthly on Kagan Structures that will increase student engagement.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

The instructional leadership team including content coaches and grade-level facilitators, will collect walk through data on the amount of teacher talk and the amount of student talk as well as the fidelity of the implementation of the Kagan structures.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

Using the results of walk through data the Instructional Leadership team will choose Kagan Structures to introduce to the teachers for the next month during the mini-pd, present the pd and then follow the inquiry cycle.

Person Responsible	Kimberlee Hayward (kimberlee.hayward@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Foster Elementary will continue to implement the community schools initiative. This initiative will allow us to continue engaging our families, which has become critically important after the mandatory school closings due to COVID-19. Since the implementation of the Community Schools initiative, all areas of the parent survey increased suggesting an increase in positive school family relationships. Parent participation in the survey also increased 70% over 18-19.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$182,938.81
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,588.99
			Notes: Measure Up! ELA and Math curriculum for 1st-5th grades. This research-based curriculum will be used to provide standards-based instruction. We will need to purchase the following quantities of each subject: First Grade: 80 SE, 5 TE Second Grade: 68 SE, 4 TE Third Grade: 70 SE, 4 TE Fourth Grade: 70 SE, 4 TE Fifth Grade: 60 SE, 4 TE			
	5100	520-Textbooks	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,410.69
			Notes: Ready MAFS curriculum for K-5 grades. This research-based curriculum will be used to provide standards-based instruction. We will need to purchase the following quantities for effective implementation: Kindergarten: 50 copies, 4 TE First Grade: 80 copies, 4 TE Second Grade: 68 copies, 4 TE Third Grade: 70 copies, 4 TE Fourth Grade: 70 copies, 4 TE Fifth Grade: 60 copies, 4 TE			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$68,000.01
			Notes: Resource Technology Teacher Provide tech classes for students focused on math & ELA (i-Ready lessons) which allows classroom teachers to participate in collaborative planning sessions with content coaches. Support student & teacher 1:1 use through coaching & PD.			

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$65,000.00
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher-SalaryFacilitate collaborative planning sessions 1 hours/week for 25 teachers, coach teachers (Tier 1 monthly, Tier 2 bi-weekly & Tier 3 weekly), analyze data, provide interventions for fifty 3-5 students/intervention cycle			
	5100	210-Retirement	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,246.55
			Notes: Technology Resource Teacher-Retirement 8.47%			
	5100	220-Social Security	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,108.46
			Notes: Technology Resource Teacher-FICA 6.2%			
	5100	220-Social Security	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$726.98
			Notes: Technology Resource Teacher-Medicare 1.45%			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$255.70
			Notes: Technology Resource Teacher-Workers Comp .51%			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,525.92
			Notes: Technology Resource Teacher-Health Ins 19%			
	5100	210-Retirement	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,059.21
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher-Retirement 8.47%			
	5100	220-Social Security	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,971.32
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher-FICA 6.2%			
	5100	220-Social Security	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$694.91
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher-Medicare 1.45%			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$244.41
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher-Workers Comp .51%			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,105.66
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher-Health Ins 19%			

2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**		**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction**		**$2,622.52**

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1481 - Foster Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,622.52
			Notes: T-Payroll for tutoring students in the bottom quartile in reading and math. T-payroll will be provided for certified tutors hired to provide tutoring services for approximately 100 below level students in grades 3-5 during the school day, after school & on Saturdays. Tutoring sessions would be planned quarterly per grading period during the day not to exceed 10			

		hours/week, after school not to exceed 2 hours/week & Saturdays not to exceed 3 hours/ week.	
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$191,425.00**