Lanier Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lanier Elementary School

4704 W MONTGOMERY AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Moon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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

Lanier Elementary School

4704 W MONTGOMERY AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[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	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

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.

The Lanier Elementary community will foster leadership skills while facilitating an education to develop each child to their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lanier's students will become lifetime learners and leaders who are prepared for life.

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
Garcia, Sarah	Principal	
Millis, Maria	Teacher, ESE	
Price, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Kevin Moon

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.*
0

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
28

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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	53	61	56	61	66	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	356
Attendance below 90 percent	5	3	3	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	4	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	62	47	58	65	51	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	6	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	62	47	58	65	51	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	6	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	53%	52%	57%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	55%	58%	46%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	50%	53%	41%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	54%	63%	53%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	57%	62%	55%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	51%	46%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	50%	53%	47%	48%	51%

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey *(table title above)*

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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	54%	-16%	62%	-24%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	51%	-4%	53%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	52%	-7%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
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	20	38	47	15	42	50	17				
ELL	9			27							
BLK	35	44		29	39		20				
HSP	38	60		40	56		37				
MUL	67			50							
WHT	66	61		59	61		75				
FRL	48	59	60	44	52	42	32				
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	18	39	55	31	36	18					
ELL	36			55	80						
BLK	36	36		36	50						
HSP	49	63		59	63		47				
MUL	39	73		47	10						
WHT	56	53		66	63		65				
FRL	44	54	58	51	55	40	45				
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	33	35	21	37	33	14				
ELL	62	64		69	82						
BLK	36	57		27	36						
HSP	44	44	50	50	53	40	33				
MUL	53	53		47	47						
WHT	55	41	30	63	64	55	56				
FRL	42	44	42	45	48	42	42				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	38
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	33
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	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Math Achievement in grades 3-5 dropped significantly in 2019. This drop may have been influenced by difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers. 2 of 4 intermediate math teachers resigned during the first quarter of school and these position took months to replace.

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

Math Achievement in grades 3-5 dropped significantly in 2019. This drop may have been influenced by difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers. 2 of 4 intermediate math teachers resigned during the first quarter of school and these position took months to replace.

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.

Science scores were well below the state average, with only 43% of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the Science State assessment. This drop may have been influenced by difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers. 2 of 2 intermediate science teachers resigned during the first quarter of school and these position took months to replace.

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

ELA Learning gains increased from 57% to 62% of students making learning gains. This was likely a result of increased PLC collaborative planning time along with increased Reading Coach supporting in the classrooms.

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

Attendance and the number of students who earned a Level 1 on state assessments continue to be areas of concern.

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

1. Math Achievement (Level 3 +)
2. Math Bottom Quartile learning gains
3. Science Achievement (Level 3 +)
4. ELA Learning Gains
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percent age of students who scored a Level 3 or higher on the 2019 math FSA was 48%. This is 9% decrease from 2018. Students who score a Level 1-2 are typically below level and this creates learning gaps that can be challenging to address as math content moves forward and requires mastery of previous skills in order to be successful with grade level content.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students who score a Level 3 or higher on the 2021 Math FSA will increase from 48% to 54%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lanier will implement school-wide monthly math assessments to monitor student progress, identify critical learning needs, and address student learning gaps through small group instruction. Each student will set an individual target goal for these monthly assessments and monitor their progress each month. Teachers will meet in PLCs monthly to analyze student assessment data and create action plans to address student learning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing common monthly assessments will allow us to better monitor student learning by providing standards-aligned assessments and identify learning trends and needs. By review and analyzing student assessment data each month, teachers will be able to intervene quickly and address any misconceptions and learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Plan and organize monthly math assessments, to include:
1. Create calendar for monthly math assessments for each grade level
2. Schedule PLC meetings each month to analyze assessment results and create action plans to address student learning needs.
3. Organize, copy, and distribute math assessments for each grade every month.

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Create Systems to facilitate data analysis related to math monthly assessments, to include:
1. Create student goal setting and progress monitoring forms
2. Create online data spreadhsheets to monitor student progress each month
3. Create agenda and data anaylsis forms to facilitate PLCs and dig deep into the data (item analysis, trends, misconceptions, action plan, etc.)

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percent age of students who scored a Level 3 or higher on the 2019 ELA portion of FSA was 53%. This is a 3% increase from 2018, however , we feel that all students should be proficient in the areas of reading and writing. Students who score a Level 1-2 are typically below level and this creates learning gaps that can be challenging to fill as the rigor increases with each grade level. We know that literacy is a critical skill and can affect all other academic subject areas. Also, students who are not reading on grade level by 3rd grade has increased risk on not graduating high school on time.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of students who score a Level 3+ on the ELA portion of the 2021 FSA will increase from 53% to 62%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement weekly formative assessments in the area of reading to provide teachers more thorough assessment information so that they can design instruction that is based on the needs of the students. Systems for formative assessment will include: common assessments, data tracking, student self-assessment, and feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In the past, teachers have followed the instructional pacing guides provided by the district with limited information on student learning. There has been a lack of focus on formative assessment which has hindered our ability to teach to the individual needs of the students. Furthermore, students entering the 20-21 school year will have increased learning gaps due to the COVID-19 pandemic and we want to be prepared to have a stronger grasp of their learning needs in order to address these learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide Professional Development to the staff related to Formative Assessments. We will hold in-house sessions and book studies based on books: Driven by Data (Brambick-Santoyo) and Embedding Formative Assessment (Dylan Williams).

Person Responsible   Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Utilize the Instructional Leadership Team to identify areas for staff PD needs, design, and facilitate PD for teachers. The ILT Team will convene 2x per month to monitor the implementation of formative assessment throughout the year and guide professional learning.

Person Responsible   Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percent age of students who scored a Level 3 or higher on the 2019 ELA portion of FSA was 53%. This is a 3% increase from 2018, however , we feel that all students should be proficient in the areas of reading and writing. Students who score a Level 1-2 are typically below level and this creates learning gaps that can be challenging to fill as the rigor increases with each grade level. We know that literacy is a critical skill and can affect all other academic subject areas. Also, students who are not reading on grade level by 3rd grade has increased risk on not graduating high school on time.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of students who score a Level 3+ on the ELA portion of the 2021 FSA will increase from 53% to 62%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement K-5 phonics curriculum that is aligned to standards and provides targeted instruction on specific phonics skills that scaffold from one grade to the next.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Phonics is a critical foundational skill for reading. We have found that phonic is consistently a low-performing area based on i-Ready diagnostic assessment data. Without this critical skill, students have trouble accessing and decoding the text which then impedes their comprehension. Using the resources, Making Sense of Phonics and Words Their Way, we will collaboratively plan and deliver daily phonics instruction to all students PreK-5.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Leadership Team will review information from Making Sense of Phonics and Words Their Way to develop a scope and sequence that has K-5 vertical alignment and provides systematic phonics instruction focused on isolated, critical skills.

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Teachers will meet in weekly collaborative planning to create weekly lesson plans that address specific phonics skills based on the needs of the students.

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Vertical PLC meetings will be held quarterly to align phonics instruction across grade levels and share best practices for phonics instruction.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	43% of students scored a Level 3+ (proficiency) on the 2019 Statewide Science Assessment. The is the lowest achieving category for our school out of all other subject areas. Science is a critical academic subject that builds foundational content in order to prepare students for college and career.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of students who score proficient (Level 3+) on the 2021 Statewide Science Assessment will increase from 43% to 54%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement weekly formative assessments in the area of reading to provide teachers more thorough assessment information so that they can design instruction that is based on the needs of the students. Systems for formative assessment will include: common assessments, data tracking, student self-assessment, and feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In the past, teachers have followed the instructional pacing guides provided by the district with limited information on student learning. There has been a lack of focus on formative assessment which has hindered our ability to teach to the individual needs of the students. Furthermore, students entering the 20-21 school year will have increased learning gaps due to the COVID-19 pandemic and we want to be prepared to have a stronger grasp of their learning needs in order to address these learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop school-wide systems for data tracking and recording assessment information (include teacher and student data tracking systems).

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Teachers will develop formative assessments in weekly collaborative planning sessions, implement planned assessments in the classroom, and meet in PLCs to analyze data and make necessary instructional adjustments to meet the needs of the students.

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

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 convene weekly to address and monitor and respond to all other needs, including attendance, bottom quartile growth in ELA and math, and ESSA subgroups not meeting 41% (black, ELL, ESE).

**Attendance will be tracked weekly and monitored by the school leadership team. A robust plan for attendance will be created in conjunction with the Students Service Team and School Leadership Team. Several incentives will be provided to encourage students to attend regularly. Students attending less than 90% will be identified within the first 20 days and monitored weekly. Specific individual plans will be created for any students who attend less than 90% to intervene and improve their attendance. **

Additionally, the School Leadership Team will create plans to closely monitor the Bottom Quartile in reading and math. Data wall that target monthly assessment data will be created in both subject areas to monitor their progress and interventions will be developed for students not meeting adequate growth each month. The School Leadership Team will host "Chat and Chew" weekly with all BQ students to confer with students about their progress, monitor goals, and provide specific feedback to each student.

Finally, the School Leadership Team will monitor ESSA subgroup data for those subgropus performing under 41% (black, ELL, and ESE). The Team will review monthly assessment data for each subgroup in all subject areas, and create interventions to address any groups who are not meeting adequate growth each month.

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.

At Lanier, we place a strong emphasis on a positive school culture. We received an overall composite score of 94% on the 2020 ASQi culture survey, one of the highest rated in the district. The 2020-21 school year will begin our 6th year of implementation with Franklin Covey's Leader in Me program, a school-wide transformational process that focus on leadership, culture, and academics. Lanier was recently named a Leaders in Me Lighthouse School, one of 400 exemplar models for the school worldwide. This process allows us to address daily social-emotional lessons that are rooted in the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, hold daily morning meetings in each classroom to build and strengthen classroom culture, and allow all stakeholders to have a voice in school-wide decision making. Each student participates in the 4 Disciplines of Execution goal setting process, where they set individual academic goals and monitor their

own progress towards these goals. We also provide our staff annual training to empower student leadership and foster student-centered learning in each classroom.

According to our Measurable Results Survey results (performed by Franklin Covey), two areas we have identified to improve for the 2020-21 school year are School Belonging (rated 66/100) and Industry and Perseverance (rated 57/100). We will provide staff development on both of these topics to allow teachers to have specific strategies and action plans to address both of these areas, as well as monitor our progress through quarterly student surveys.

Finally, in order to continue to encourage family involvement and parent voice, we will create our first ever Parent Lighthouse Team. This group of parents will meet monthly to support to the work of the school in all 3 areas (academics, leadership, culture) and provide feedback and suggestions for school improvement.

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00