Lopez Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lopez Elementary School

200 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Zemenaye Harris

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%) 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

Lopez Elementary School

200 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

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.

We will be a community of teaching and learning excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will provide a challenging curriculum in an atmosphere of encouragement for individuals to reach their full potential.

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
Engle, Michael	Principal	To oversee all portions of the SIP. The Leadership team meets regularly (weekly) with the purpose to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.
Gay, Kenneth	Assistant Principal	To oversee all portions of the SIP. The Leadership team meets regularly (weekly) with the purpose to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.
Piccorelli, Rachel	Instructional Coach	To oversee all portions of the SIP. The Leadership team meets regularly (weekly) with the purpose to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Zemenaye Harris

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.*
2

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

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 (46%) 2017-18: C (51%)

	2016-17: C (53%)
	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	64	64	87	71	88	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	11	13	22	16	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	
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	95	78	81	91	83	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	25	17	17	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	1	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	8	2	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	95	78	81	91	83	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	25	17	17	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	1	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	8	2	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	51%	52%	57%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	55%	58%	56%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	50%	53%	38%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	63%	56%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	62%	58%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	51%	53%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	50%	53%	54%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
	2018	49%	55%	-6%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	57%	-2%	64%	-9%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	51%	-13%	53%	-15%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
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	41	46	28	38	52	46	29				
ELL	30	39		44	52		10				
BLK	41	41		41	56		23				
HSP	48	51	18	55	63	31	35				
MUL	47	46		53	77						
WHT	58	43	15	58	51	36	58				
FRL	49	47	21	50	58	48	43				

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	24	35	33	31	57	50	17				

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
ELL	41	35		48	63		50				
BLK	45	33	27	40	63		31				
HSP	48	42	29	59	73		38				
MUL	50	55		56	55						
WHT	65	46	40	62	63	40	69				
FRL	52	42	35	52	63	52	51				
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	18	38	31	27	62	53	25				
ELL	48	36		52	57						
BLK	55	55		50	53						
HSP	49	50		60	50		47				
WHT	56	59	35	56	64	63	54				
FRL	50	54	39	51	58	55	50				

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	47
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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

English Language Learners	
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	40
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	44
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	56
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	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
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.

Our ELA Lowest 25th Percentile is consistently our lowest performing component, scoring over 20 points lower than the district and state. When this component is broken down into classes over a course of years, there is a direct correlation between teacher effectiveness and student achievement, especially within the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Our students within this component who make the most growth, are in most cases, working with teachers strong in instructional clarity and student engagement. These teachers provide solid core instruction and differentiate to meet the needs of the variety of learners.

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

Our Science Achievement showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Although this is closely connected to our students' struggle in ELA Achievement, specifically reading nonfiction texts, it is also uncovering a need for more carefully aligned science instruction with a high level of academic language.

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.

Our ELA Lowest 25th Percentile has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. When this component is broken down into classes over a course of years, there is a direct correlation between teacher effectiveness and student achievement, especially within the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Our students within this component who make the most growth, are in most cases, working with teachers strong in instructional clarity and student engagement. These teachers provide solid core instruction and differentiate to meet the needs of the variety of learners.

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

Our ELA Learning Gains showed the most improvement. Our school shifted our focus to strengthening the core through the use of learning walks, coaching cycles, and modeled lessons. We launched a study focused on student dialogic discussion and its role in the classroom, and worked to implement more consistent and data drive professional learning communities.

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

The EWS trends indicate that attendance, particularly in kindergarten, is an area of concern. Our students must be present with a high quality teacher. Another area of concern is our increasing number of students scoring a level 1 (not meeting proficiency) in 3rd grade.

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

1. Increasing student engagement through the use of collaborative conversations or student-led dialogic discussions.
2. Meeting the needs of learners through differentiated and small group instruction.
3. Leveraging the instructional strength within our building through the effective use of PLCs.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement will increase when all students, with a concentration on our students with disabilities and African American students, are actively engaged in the process of their learning. By designing lessons and structures that foster agency within students, they are more likely to engage in and transfer learning to other texts, tasks, and topics. This focus was identified after careful analysis of not only schoolwide data, but also individual teacher practices, trends, and data.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement will increase as a result of increased student engagement. Student engagement will be measured by active participation in learning through weekly walk-through data noting evidence of students who are: actively engaged in the use of tools/manipulatives, enthusiastic with regards to the topic/content, contributing to modification in lesson, reflecting on application of standards, and facilitating content focused conversations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Engle (michael.engle@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our main focus for increasing student engagement is the use of collaborative conversations or student-led dialogic discussions. By successfully engaging in conversation focused on a text, task, or topic, our students are strengthening their comprehension of the learning process, which builds student agency and the transfer of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student-led dialogic discussions enhance student engagement and allow for a natural flow of differentiated support.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher/Support Staff provide expectations and opportunities for students to engage in productive collaborative conversations.

Students demonstrate a clear understanding of expectations established for collaborative conversations.

Effectiveness will be monitored through targeted walk-throughs, informal/formal evaluation results, coaching cycles with resource personnel, and site-based staff development with a focus on knowledge of student needs
and planning.

Person Responsible	Michael Engle (michael.engle@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement will increase when all students receive targeted and differentiated support, but especially our ELL students, as a supplement to effective core instruction. While strong core instruction is essential to student success, targeted and differentiated instruction is a key component to the success of our most striving students. This focus was identified after careful analysis of not only schoolwide data, but also individual teacher practices, trends, and data.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement will increase as a result of targeted and differentiated support as a supplement to effective core instruction. This instructional practice will be monitored and measured through weekly walk-through data noting amount of time spent in differentiated small group instruction. The effectiveness of instruction and impact on students will be progress monitored through biweekly/monthly PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Engle (michael.engle@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our main focus for targeted and differentiated support will be to shift the way we think about student groupings. Using the frameworks from Fisher and Frey's work on productive group work, we will consider the following options for grouping: ability, standard focus, interest, or levels of understanding. By varying the types of structures we use in the classroom to meet the needs of our learners, we tailor our approach to maximize student engagement and achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By planning for varied but targeted student groupings, we purposefully work to create interdependent and positive interaction among students, ensure group and individual accountability, assess and monitor students' developing understanding, and develop responsive lessons based on the progress monitoring data collected.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher/Support Staff provide expectations and opportunities for students to engage in productive and differentiated small group work.

Students demonstrate a clear understanding of expectations established for differentiated small group work. During instruction, students are paired, grouped, or working independently towards mastery of the standards or success criteria.

Effectiveness will be monitored through targeted walk-throughs, informal/formal evaluation results, coaching cycles with resource personnel, and site-based staff development with a focus on knowledge of student needs
and planning.

Person Responsible	Michael Engle (michael.engle@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement will increase as a result of productive data driven conversations surrounding standard analysis, specific student needs, and best practices in instruction. This focus was identified after careful analysis of not only schoolwide data, but also individual teacher practices, trends, and data. PLCs are designed to leverage the strengths of the individual professionals for the success of the group.
Measurable Outcome:	Productive and effective collaboration among colleagues will have a positive impact on student achievement, especially that of our most striving learners. The effectiveness of these communities and the impact on students will be progress monitored through biweekly/monthly PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Engle (michael.engle@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	By using the intensive reflection and job-embedded learning process of PLCs, we are shifting our focus to continuous improvement in staff performance and student achievement. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another through careful analysis of what does and does not work for student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs have merged into the catch-all term of every meeting, diluting the actual plan and purpose of a productive professional learning community. By refocusing our school on the plan and purpose of PLCs, we maximize the strength within our site for increased student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers/Support Staff will implement the following process for reflection:
1. STUDY- staff work in collaborative planning teams to examine and discuss learning expectations.
2. SELECT- teams select a common assessment in connection with the standards.
3. PLAN- teams plan for the use of evidence-based instructional strategies and the criteria for success.
4. IMPLEMENT- teams implement lessons, record successes and challenges, and gather evidence on student learning.
5. ANALYZE- teams review student work and discuss student understanding of the standards.
6. ADJUST- teams reflect on the implications of the analysis of student work and discuss potential modifications to instructional strategies.
**This process is not linear, and is not expected to be completed in one sitting. The intention is to create a process of deep thought and reflection surrounding student data and teacher practice. **

Person Responsible	Michael Engle (michael.engle@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

na

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.

We will use "spotted being good" behavior tracker to promote a positive school climate. Names will be draw on the morning show for prizes and recognition of all grade levels. Behavior charts promoting positive classroom behavior to increase good behavior. All stakeholders are included in the planning and implementing of this plan. We have a culture committee that will monitor the school environment during the school year. We will receive feedback from teachers, students and parents to ensure it's effectiveness and adjust as needed to ensure a positive school culture continues during the school year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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