Dover Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dover Elementary

3035 NELSON AVE, Dover, FL 33527

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gina Becker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (32%)
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 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

Dover Elementary

3035 NELSON AVE, Dover, FL 33527

[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	94%

School Grades History

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

The District's Mission is:

To provide an education and the supports that enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

With that in mind, we have developed the following Mission for our school:

To provide an education that enables our students to be respectful, responsible and high achieving learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The District's Vision is:

Preparing Students for Life

At Dover, we are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020.

With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Inspiring productive contributors to our world.

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
Becker, Gina	Principal	The Principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary, adult, ESE or other specialized public school sites. The Principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards. SPECIFIC DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES: -Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff, reviews of teachers' activities, and issuance of directives. -Administers and develops educational programs for students with mental or physical disabilities. -Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school. -Establishes and maintains relationships with colleges, community organizations, and other schools to coordinate educational services. -Requisitions and allocates supplies, equipment, and instructional material as needed. -Directs preparation of class schedules, cumulative records, and attendance reports. -Walks about school building and property to monitor safety and security. -Plans and monitors school budget. -Plans for and directs building maintenance. -Performs any other duties as assigned. -Responsibilities and tasks outlined in this document are not exhaustive and may change as determined by the needs of the district. Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor School Psychologist Behavior Team Representative School Social Worker Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches and Resource Teachers (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches) SAC Chairs The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, Gina Becker

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.*
37

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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
52

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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (39%)

	2016-17: D (39%)
	2015-16: D (32%)
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	97	88	102	92	105	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	564
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	12	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	8	9	5	31	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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	31	110	99	129	87	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	13	8	11	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	35	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136

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	1	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	19	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	31	110	99	129	87	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	13	8	11	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	35	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136

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	1	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	19	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	31%	52%	57%	25%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	55%	58%	45%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	39%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	54%	63%	36%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	62%	58%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	46%	51%	50%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	50%	53%	23%	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	32%	52%	-20%	58%	-26%
	2018	35%	53%	-18%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	30%	55%	-25%	58%	-28%
	2018	22%	55%	-33%	56%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison	8%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					
05	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
	2018	22%	51%	-29%	55%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	57%	-8%	64%	-15%
	2018	47%	57%	-10%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	60%	-15%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	51%	-19%	53%	-21%
	2018	29%	52%	-23%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	6	20	20	20	56	73					
ELL	25	41	50	49	54	54	25				
HSP	30	44	53	54	58	56	36				
WHT	38	33		45	69						
FRL	31	43	50	52	58	59	34				
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	8	35	45	19	50	45	10				
ELL	22	31	29	42	58	41	21				
HSP	27	32	29	48	63	50	33				

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
WHT	21	42		19	43						
FRL	27	32	30	46	62	46	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	12	10	9	17	30	27					
ELL	20	40	36	33	55	51	12				
HSP	25	44	40	37	58	50	24				
WHT	19			25							
FRL	25	43	38	36	57	48	24				

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	48
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	44
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	46
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	48
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.

FSA data shows that only 31% of students are proficient in ELA. Only 35% of Students with Disabilities are proficient in ELA. The deficits in ELA proficiency schoolwide and specifically with Students with Disabilities can be attributed in part to the large number of English Language Learners and a need for targeted standards based instruction.

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

Math learning gains were down 2% from the previous year. There were a number of teachers that were new to the school and/or new to the grade level. This could have contributed to the slight decline in math learning gains.

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.

ELA Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Dover scores were 26% below the state average. The deficits in ELA proficiency schoolwide and specifically with Students with Disabilities can be attributed in part to the large number of English Language Learners and a need for targeted standards based instruction.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement with an increase of 20% from the previous year. Student assessment data was used to form targeted intervention groups. Groups were provided with standards based remediation from resource teachers.

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

Attendance is the largest area of concern with 48 students with attendance below 90%

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. SWD Learning Gains
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Designing and Implementing an Instructional Infrastructure 2019-20 Diagnostic 2 i-Ready data evidenced that 53% of students in grades K-2 were proficient in reading and 37% were proficient in math. 2018-19 FSA data evidenced that 31% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in reading, 53% were proficient in math, and 34% were proficient in science. 43% of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on FSA ELA and 59% made learning gains on FSA Math. These schoolwide averages fall below District and State averages. This evidences a need for the design and implementation of schoolwide systems that ensure that all students are engaged in lessons that are fully aligned with the rigor of the standards.
Measurable Outcome:	56% of students in grades K-2 will be proficient in reading and 50% will be proficient in math, as evidenced by i-Ready. 45% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in reading, 60% will be proficient in math, and 44% in science, as evidenced by FSA. 50% of students in grades 3-5 will show learning gains on FSA ELA and 60% will show learning gains on FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina Becker (gina.becker@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Based Planning and Instruction Facilitated by Instructional Coaches
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Based Instruction, or the practice of aligning learning to standards, streamlines instruction and ensures that teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets. The rigor of the standard is maintained and expectations for student learning are clear.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Design- Resource teachers (Reading Coach, Reading Resource, and Math Coach) will facilitate weekly standards based instructional design sessions. Common assessments will be developed and used to monitor student achievement. One day a quarter will be devoted to curriculum mapping. Release time will be provided for teachers to attend, with substitutes hired to provide this time as needed.

PLCs - Teachers will participate in PLC meetings. Common assessments will be analyzed and used in designing differentiated instruction.

Coaching Cycles - Resource and classroom teachers will collaborate on coaching cycles focused on areas of need.

Targeted Student Instruction - Content Area Resource teachers, ELL Teacher, ESE Teachers, Academic Intervention Specialists, and Migrant Advocates) will work with targeted groups of students on identified areas of need.

Data Monitoring - The leadership team will track and monitor all ESSA subgroups. A data wall will be used to display the results of this monitoring.

Person Responsible	Gina Becker (gina.becker@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher Clarity 2019-20 Diagnostic 2 i-Ready data evidenced that 53% of students in grades K-2 were proficient in reading and 37% were proficient in math. 2018-19 FSA data evidenced that 31% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in reading, 53% were proficient in math, and 34% were proficient in science. 43% of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on FSA ELA and 59% made learning gains on FSA Math. These schoolwide averages fall below District and State averages. This evidences a need for the design and implementation of schoolwide systems that ensure that all students are engaged in lessons that are fully aligned with the rigor of the standards.
Measurable Outcome:	56% of students in grades K-2 will be proficient in reading and 50% will be proficient in math, as evidenced by i-Ready. 45% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in reading, 60% will be proficient in math, and 44% in science, as evidenced by FSA. 50% of students in grades 3-5 will show learning gains on FSA ELA and 60% will show learning gains on FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina Becker (gina.becker@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	* Teacher Clarity is shown to have an effect size of 0.7, meaning that when teachers clearly communicate, it has a large impact on student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

- Teachers will use I Can Statements to set clear learning targets, establish a clear purpose for learning, and communicate clear assessment criteria.

- Bulletin boards and/or whiteboards will be used to display high quality student work along with learning targets and criteria for success.

Person Responsible	Gina Becker (gina.becker@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School Social Worker will monitor attendance and work with families to improve attendance rates.

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.

- Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports are research based strategies designed to decrease problem behavior by teaching new skills and making changes in a person's environment.

- The House System increases students' sense of belonging, encourages healthy competition and teamwork, and sets high expectations for student success.

Positive Behavior Interventions and Support:

- Common language and expectations will be used schoolwide. Common language and expectations will be displayed on posters throughout the school.

- Monthly behavioral/RtI Meetings will be held.

House System Focused on Character Traits:

- Faculty will implement the House System focused on character traits to build culture and improve climate.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00