

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lomax Magnet Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lomax Magnet Elementary School

4207 N 26TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Jacobsen Capps

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lomax Magnet Elementary School

4207 N 26TH 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 KG-5	Yes	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

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.

Lomax will build a community of active thinking and learning citizens through exploration, enrichment, electives and expeditions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Lomax community will develop the individual talents and strengths of each child.

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
Carolina, Ire	Principal	The person responsible for providing overall instructional leadership, responsible for school improvement planning. The principal actively engages others in all stages of the process: planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating progress of the plan.
Barr, Katrina	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with monitoring instruction and managing facilities. The assistant principal supports the principal to actively engage others in all stages of the process: planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating progress of the plan.
Barker, Repersha	School Counselor	The school guidance counselor ensures that mental health and social emotional training is provided to support students. Serves as the parent engagement liaison and works to provide motivational events to improve school-wide culture for learning.
Swank, Alicia	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher for our magnet program. Responsible for community outreach, mentoring, and promoting our magnet program.
Hogue-Brown, Sachia	Instructional Coach	Provide coaching cycles and feedback to teachers to improve instruction. Monitor reading data and organize curriculum to improve student outcomes.
Fishbein, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Provide coaching cycles and feedback to teachers to improve instruction. Monitor reading data and organize curriculum to improve student outcomes.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/23/2019, Sarah Jacobsen Capps

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	59	54	568	58	77	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	888
Attendance below 90 percent	12	10	13	9	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	47	54	63	66	72	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	2	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	2	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	

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	2	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
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	47	54	63	66	72	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	2	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	

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	2	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	

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	2	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
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	55%	52%	57%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	58%	40%	55%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	50%	53%	29%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	63%	55%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	39%	57%	62%	63%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	10%	46%	51%	46%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	50%	53%	45%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
	2018	76%	55%	21%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%
	2018	69%	57%	12%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	60%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	14	30	25	23	19	16	11				
ELL	56	58		56	38						
ASN	77			100							
BLK	51	48	35	49	33	10	39				
HSP	60	52		57	41		50				
WHT	64	50		73	60						
FRL	47	45	33	46	29	11	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
SWD	15	30	25	24	33	19					
ELL	45			64							
ASN	82			100							
BLK	49	40	27	55	48	26	29				
HSP	50	50		58	55						
WHT	74	64		79	73						
FRL	47	39	24	55	46	28	28				
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	14	16	17	17	44	40					
ELL	17	20		17	45						
BLK	48	33	26	47	59	46	32				
HSP	47	42		63	58		44				
WHT	80	46		65	62						

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	46	42	29	48	61	47	37				

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	42
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	89
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	38
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	53
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	62
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	36
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was math for students in the lower 25th percentile. 10% of these students made academic gains in math. Contributing factors to low performance was the lack of differentiating for student in math. Teachers did not make adjustments

for instruction to meet the needs of low performing students. Teachers didn't respond to the data provided by i-Ready to address the instructional groupings. Also, the lack of teacher retention during the year that the assessment was given, may have been a contributing factor. Students were taught by substitute teachers which led to inconsistency in instruction.

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

Math achievement overall was lower than the prior year. Contributing factors for this could be that teachers weren't using the instructional guides for planning sessions to teach grade level standards. Students did not spend their allotted time on i-Ready, the supplemental tool that helps to diagnose math instructional needs. Teacher expertise or professional development was not provided. Also, the lack of teacher retention during the year affected student learning. Students were taught by substitute teachers which led to inconsistency.

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.

The math component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Factors that contributed to this gap and trends were mentioned above.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA component. Students in grade 5 gained 18 percentage points, the highest in 3 years. Teachers were beginning to learn how to cluster standards and were at the beginning stages of unpacking them. This helped teachers to determine what to teach.

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

There are two potential concerns with EWS data based on the 2019-2020 data. There is a concern with grade 2 retentions and third graders that have moved on to 4th grade because there was no FSA. Differentiated, targeted small group instruction has to take place.

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

1. Small group instruction must begin expeditiously to catch students who have learning gaps because of no face to face teacher contact for the last nine weeks
2. Differentiated and targeted instruction to meet the needs of all learners
3. Visible learning
4. Collaborative planning with the goal of determining what work students will produce to determine if standards have been met
5. Math instruction, professional development, and data analysis with common assessments.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

End of the year data indicates that the strategies used may not have yielded the results that were anticipated. Teachers needed more support with fully understanding grade level standards and how to analyze the data from both i-Ready, math unit assessments and formative assessments to make instructional decisions that would lead to improvement. The support of a math coach/resource is needed to help teachers to plan effective lessons by addressing the grade level standards and creating performance levels. The math resource can also support data analysis to help teachers address learning gaps by planning for differentiated instruction to include foundational skills.

Measurable Outcome:

By spring 2021, 50% of 3rd - 5th grade students will show learning gains in math (including lowest 25%) as measured by FSA math. The math achievement level will increase from 54% to 60%. Math overall gain scores will increase from 39% to 60% with an increase of 30% for the lowest 25% (10%-40%).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Fishbein (amanda.fishbein@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will increase their knowledge of best practices in math instruction and problem solving. Teachers will develop lessons to provide differentiated math instruction to groups of students based on data sources i.e. common assessments and formative assessments. Teachers will engage in side-by-side coaching and coaching cycles. Grade level fishbowl learning opportunities will be put in place for teachers to observe model lessons conducted by colleagues and math coach. Classroom walk-throughs, common assessments, formative assessment and student pass rates in i-Ready math will be used to determine effectiveness of the strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

35% of U.S. children enter kindergarten unprepared to learn, with most lacking the vocabulary and sentence structure crucial to school success."Furthermore, children in poverty who have had limited language opportunities typically have less problem solving abilities (Guerra and Schutz, 2001), a critical skill in mathematics." As they progress in school, students lacking a firm foundation of vocabulary knowledge have more difficulty obtaining meaning while reading. Teachers' understanding of math content was positively related to their students' achievement in four of six studies that were reviewed - Joan D. Pasley "Ramping Up Teachers' Math and Science Content Knowledge." One very popular PD solution is coaching. On-site coaches can address student and teacher needs as they happen.

Action Steps to Implement

.Review FSA 2019 data and i-Ready math data to identify focus areas in math for each grade level.-

Person Responsible

Ire Carolina (ire.carolina@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Provide PD overview of tools for instruction in beginning in August to address Foundational skills, problem solving and differentiating instruction in math to effectively work with whole class and small group instruction.

Person Responsible

Amanda Fishbein (amanda.fishbein@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Conduct walkthroughs to determine teacher needs and levels of support. Use data collected from administrative team and math resource to provide tiered levels of support.

Person Responsible Amanda Fishbein (amanda.fishbein@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Conduct job embedded Professional Development and coaching cycles to address grade level standards in mathematics. Teachers will increase their foundational knowledge to teach problem solving and how to provide differentiated math instruction to students. Teachers will engage in side-by-side coaching and fish bowls with the math coach. Substitutes will be utilized to provide coverage to allow teachers and grade level teams to participate in a modeling sessions with the coach . Substitutes will also be needed as teachers work with the math coach to analyze and create responses to district formative assessments, i-Ready assessments, unit tests, and common assessments.

Person Responsible Amanda Fishbein (amanda.fishbein@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Analyze and share data in PLCs to determine next steps. Data collected from monthly common assessments, math unit assessments, formative assessments and exit tickets will be used to plan for instruction.

Person Responsible Amanda Fishbein (amanda.fishbein@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Provide parent information and distribute math packs to parents -These family engagement math packs and materials needed for parents to support learning at home. These math packs will support students at home in need of additional practice with various math concepts. This will provide families an opportunity to engage in what students are learning in math.

Person Responsible Amanda Fishbein (amanda.fishbein@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

All subgroups of students are not meeting grade level standards and expectations in reading because they may have gaps in their learning. Students are struggling with applying their understanding of grade level standards. Teachers may need to increase their knowledge of reading and the pedagogy of teaching. Teacher understanding of how and when to scaffold lessons, differentiate instruction, and provide effective questioning may be a barrier to student learning. Therefore, providing adequate time for teachers to work with the reading coach to plan differentiated lessons will yield more effective instruction of students in small groups. Providing time for teachers participate in job embedded professional development will provide teachers with "real" time knowledge to address their instructional needs.

Measurable Outcome:

By spring 2021, 3rd - 5th grade students will increase satisfactory achievement from 55%-60% on the ELA FSA. ELA learning gains will increase from 50%-60%. ELA learning gains for the lower 25% will increase from 37%-50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sachia Hogue-Brown (sachia.hogue-brown@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Provided professional development in reading foundational skills and guided reading to plan for differentiated groups. Provide classrooms with a variety of books at varying reading levels to encourage reading and improve vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In Hattie's 2009 book, *Visible Learning*, he reports that teacher clarity has an effect size of $d = 0.75$. Organization, Explanation, Examples & Guided Practice and Assessment of Student Learning. a growing body of research shows positive results for full implementation of differentiated instruction in mixed-ability classrooms (Rock, Gregg, Ellis, & Gable, 2008). In one three-year study, Canadian scholars researched the application and effects of differentiated instruction in K-12 classrooms in Alberta. They found that differentiated instruction consistently yielded positive results across a broad range of targeted groups. After the release of the National Reading Panel report (NRP & NICHD, 2000), it became common for educators to refer to "the big five" components of reading: Phonological awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary and Comprehension. All are important to developing skilled reading ability and should be included in the daily instruction provided to beginning readers.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development beginning in August on the Next Steps in Guided Reading. Teachers will gain greater knowledge of guided reading use instructional tools to plan guided reading well. Teachers will engage with this book during weekly planning sessions. This book will provide the platform for teachers to effectively plan for all students specifically our students that fall in the lower 25% of our population in reading.

Person Responsible

Sachia Hogue-Brown (sachia.hogue-brown@hcps.net)

Collaborative Grade Level Planning- Teachers will engage in weekly planning sessions to conduct standards based planning in reading.

Person Responsible

Ire Carolina (ire.carolina@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

PD on new reading programs SIPP and Achieve 3000. These resources will address student learning gaps in reading and address the needs of students who working at grade level or beyond.

Person Responsible Katrina Barr (katrina.barr@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Coaching cycles to address the learning needs of individual teachers.

Person Responsible Sachia Hogue-Brown (sachia.hogue-brown@hcps.net)

Job embedded- Professional Development will be provided to teachers to observe practices in reading. This will increase knowledge of reading and "real" time knowledge.

Person Responsible Sachia Hogue-Brown (sachia.hogue-brown@hcps.net)

Support teachers in analyzing formative data and creating action plans to address student learning needs.

Person Responsible Sachia Hogue-Brown (sachia.hogue-brown@hcps.net)

Work with identified groups of students in the fall who are below grade level in reading.

Person Responsible Sachia Hogue-Brown (sachia.hogue-brown@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Positive Behavior Intervention Support project will be implemented in the fall of 2020. We will add to our school wide expectations and modify our token economy system to provide student incentives for meeting classroom and school-wide expectations.

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.

The school plans to continue to build positive relationships with the families and community stakeholders by doing the following:

*Communicating with the families through the school newsletter, website, Edsby, parentlink, flyers, twitter, facebook, student agendas, and other notifications.

- *Establish business partners and community partners to support students and our magnet initiatives.
- *Conducting monthly family nights
- *Parent workshops

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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