

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Lamb Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lamb Elementary

6274 S 78TH ST, Tampa, FL 33619

<http://lamb.mysdhc.org/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Shawnette Singleton**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Lamb Elementary

6274 S 78TH ST, Tampa, FL 33619

<http://lamb.mysdhc.org/>

### 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 KG-5	Yes	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

### 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 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.**

Lamb Elementary School will provide the highest quality educational experience where students will build relationships in a positive culture, while engaging in standards-based instruction to achieve academic excellence.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our students will become leaders in their classrooms to enhance the school and the community at large.

### 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
Shields, Richard	Principal	As Principal, Richard Shields monitor the practices of the teachers at Lamb Elementary and ensures teachers are focused on educational practices that are in the best interest of the students, via walkthroughs, observations, and monitoring student performance on formative assessments. He is also dedicated to utilizing the entire leadership team to make the most informed choices for staff, students, and parents.
Sollars, Fasee	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, Fasee Sollars assists Shields with the above tasks as well as promotes a positive, caring climate for learning. She keeps an on-going path of effective communication with students, staff, and parents. This dynamic duo utilize the entire leadership team in order to enhance the fecundity at Lamb Elementary.
Ward, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Nicole Ward assists teachers with the implementation of the Math standards through planning and modeling. She develops and conducts professional development opportunities to help build the capacity and sharpen the best practices within the teachers at Lamb. Some of her other duties are facilitating PLC and data chat meetings, promoting community involvement in Lamb's mathematical program, conducts class walk-throughs and provides feedback for teachers as well as Coaching Cycle opportunities.
Dickenson, Virginia	Instructional Coach	Virginia Dickenson serves as a resource to the school for strategies, materials, and assessments to increase ELA achievement. She assists with professional development opportunities by training teachers, modeling lessons in content area, providing instructional strategies, and demonstrating best practices. Virginia also provides small group instruction for selected students and performs other duties as assigned.
Williams, Veronica	Instructional Coach	Chynell Sanders will maintain and monitor the implementation of the reading program, including professional development of school personnel. Other duties includes providing instructional coaching to all content area classroom teachers in order to improve reading instruction and acquisition, developing and conducting staff development for classroom teachers, and any other duties as requested by administration.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Tuesday 6/16/2020, Shawnette Singleton

**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.*

13



**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.*

9

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	72	75	85	84	104	114	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	1	20	13	13	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	57	31	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	64	30	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134

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	3	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	4	1	2	13	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/16/2020

### 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	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide 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	

**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	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	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	37%	52%	57%	36%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	38%	55%	58%	54%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	50%	53%	61%	51%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	39%	54%	63%	50%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	57%	62%	51%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	46%	51%	37%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	50%	53%	31%	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	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
	2018	32%	55%	-23%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	54%	-23%	62%	-31%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	57%	-12%	64%	-19%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	60%	-22%
	2018	34%	54%	-20%	61%	-27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	51%	-18%	53%	-20%
	2018	22%	52%	-30%	55%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
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	23	26	25	20	33	31	21				
ELL	14	33	42	35	61	55	20				
ASN	50			90							
BLK	31	37	30	29	37	52	29				
HSP	36	38	50	42	48	43	45				
MUL	43			21							
WHT	63	40		63	78						
FRL	35	39	36	36	45	47	37				
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	41	33	24	45	40					
ELL	27	56	60	34	55	80	8				
BLK	28	38	43	40	41	32	15				
HSP	44	55	47	45	60	59	26				
MUL	56	55		78	80						
WHT	56	46		64	62						
FRL	35	44	44	44	51	42	21				
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	46	46	27	50	31	10				
ELL	19	56	56	35	50	55	18				
BLK	30	53	65	45	48	35	28				
HSP	40	53	50	49	53	43	29				
WHT	44	40		60	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
FRL	33	54	57	48	50	35	27				

### 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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	343
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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	40
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
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	42
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.**

The data demonstrated that our lowest performance component was in ELA proficiency. Students in 3rd - 5th grade have not achieved proficiency on the reading FSA. (3RD- 32%, 4TH 39%, 5TH 32%)

Reading proficiency on FSA. One contributing factor is the high percentage of transient population and absenteeism.

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

3rd grade math declined by 19 percentage points from the prior year. Some factors that attributed to this were low student engagement and a deficit in foundation skills.

**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.**

Math achievement for Lamb was 31% while the states average was 62%. Some factors that attributed to this were low student engagement and a deficit in foundation skills.

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

5th grade science improved from 22% to 33%. Lamb faculty implemented new strategies which included active thinking, and implementing the STEM process.

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

1. The large number of Level 1's on 2019 statewide ELA/Math assessment
2. The number of students identified as retainees.

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

1. Engagement
2. English Language Arts & Math

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Student engagement refers to the degree of attention, curiosity, interest, optimism, and passion that students show when they are learning or being taught, which extends to the level of motivation they have to learn and progress in their education. Studies show that intellectually engaged students are more likely to perform well on standardized tests and are less likely to drop out of school.

Lack of engagement has impacted student across several domains. According to Lamb's ESSA data there are 4 subgroups missing the 41% target including Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black/African American Students, and Multiracial Students. Observation data was collected by administration and the leadership team to determine a lack of student engagement as a trend in a multitude of classrooms.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By the end of the 2020 - 2021 school year every below target subgroup will improve by;

SWD- 7%

ELL- 5%

Black/African American Students - 6%

Multiracial - 9%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Richard Shields (richard.shields@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teachers will participate in bi-weekly team planning supported by literacy and math coaches. During collaborative planning teachers will review current student data, analyze student work samples, and develop next steps to engage student learners through sequential learning activities.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

-ELA and Math planning scheduled on a bi-weekly basis will reinforce lesson rigor and teacher pedagogy.

-Teachers will share and analyze student data through PLC's and lesson planning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

A form outlining best practices will be used in order to enhance the accuracy of teacher walk throughs, in order to monitor teacher engagement.

**Person Responsible**

Richard Shields (richard.shields@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaches will assist classroom teachers in planning for specific student learning outcomes and increasing student engagement by implementing best practices.

**Person Responsible**

Fasee Sollars (fasee.sollars@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

During planning staff and coaches will utilize the "looking at student work" (LASW) protocol to analyze student work samples and determine next steps; with opportunities to look at ESSA subgroups data.

**Person Responsible**

Fasee Sollars (fasee.sollars@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Differentiation consists of the efforts of teachers to respond to variance among learners in the classroom. This means that teachers proactively plan varied approaches to what students need to learn, how they will learn it, and/or how they will show what they have learned. Differentiated instruction will be used to improve reading, and math proficiency. Based on the data displayed on the Early Warning Systems. 39% of students scored a Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment, and 44% of students scored a Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment. Guided lesson planning facilitated by the academic coaches assisted in determining the lack of differentiation due to the large amounts of whole group instruction that persisted. During the Comprehensive Needs Assessments in February teachers expressed need for planning and implementing this form of instruction in the class.

**Measurable Outcome:** Based on statewide FSA assessments, the percentage of ELA level 1 students will decrease from 39% to 19%; % of math level 1 students will decrease from 44% to 22%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Fasee Sollars (fasee.sollars@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Principal and assistant principal will create PD opportunities for staff
- The academic coaching will support both brick and mortar as well as eLearning teachers by modeling differentiation in the classrooms
- ESE resource teachers will plan with general education teachers to create and implement differentiated lessons.
- ELL resource teacher will work directly with general education teachers to differentiate classroom instruction for English Language learners.
- Teams will meet monthly during PLC to discuss overall trends.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Classroom walk throughs / observations
- data chats during PLC
- student data (LASW)

**Action Steps to Implement**

Analyzing student assessment data through ESSA categories, including Math monthlies, iReady growth monitoring, and Achieve3000 unit summaries.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Ward (nicole.ward@hcps.net)

Monitoring differentiation strategies through a look-for walkthrough form developed in coordination with teachers.

**Person Responsible** Richard Shields (richard.shields@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Analyzing student work samples in collaborative planning to create differentiated groups with targeted skills.

**Person Responsible** Virginia Dickenson (virginia.dickenson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The school leadership team will address the number of retained and overage students by employing the use of math monthlies, and formative assessments. This will help the leadership team target students that are at high risk for retention. The leadership team, through planning, will also take an active role in ensuring that all teachers will use a variety of strategies and resources, including technology and other supplemental resources aligned to the standards.**

## 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.

School staff will develop a positive presence with community stakeholders, with ongoing communication utilizing parent link, peach jar, and school website. All students will receive a progress report to inform parents/guardians about midterm progress towards meeting grade level standards. Student support services developed a pamphlet that provide resources available to school and the community. The school will develop a parent resource center which includes computers, materials, and other academic resources to support families in need. The schoolwide PBIS committee is developing a school wide plan that tiers students, to provide leveled behavior support. In tern this plan will be shared with the community.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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