

The School District of Lee County

Hancock Creek Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Hancock Creek Elementary School

1601 SKYLINE DR, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

<http://han.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Denise Phillips Luster

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (44%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Lee 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	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Hancock Creek Elementary School

1601 SKYLINE DR, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

<http://han.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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 Hancock Creek Elementary family will inspire and cultivate all learners to their fullest potential through the implementation of engaging and relevant learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a 1st choice school of excellence for students, parents and educators.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Phillips-Luster, Dr. Denise	Principal	
Conley, Jessica	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Denise Phillips Luster

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

723

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	104	124	102	139	132	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	723
Attendance below 90 percent	7	29	21	32	26	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	34	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	26	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	30	20	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	3	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Number of students enrolled															
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA															
Course failure in Math															
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment															
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		
The number of students identified as retainees:		
Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:														
Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:														
Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
 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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	57%	57%	53%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				42%	56%	58%	50%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	50%	53%	41%	47%	48%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement				50%	62%	63%	49%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	65%	62%	39%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	54%	51%	29%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	52%	53%	50%	54%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	61%	-1%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	58%	-18%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	50%	0%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6/6.5	18/19.1	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/3.6	20/22	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/1.9	0/0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17/15.3	32/26.2	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/5.5	18/14.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/11.5	40/36	52/45.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/11./	2/18.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/50	2/40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/4.8	23/20.9	46/41.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/10	3/27.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/25	1/20
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36/36	56/51.9	62/53.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/16.7	2/28.6	2/22.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/20	2/16.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/11.9	26/24.5	49/43.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/16.7	1/16.7	2/22.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/10	1/9.1

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		34/28.6	50/40.7	55/45.1
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	1/7.7
	English Language Learners		0/0	1/12.5	2/25
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		11/9.6	27/22	38/31.4
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	2/15.4
	English Language Learners		1/14.3	1/12.5	2/25
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		23/19.8	39/34.8	52/48.6
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		2/15.4	1/8.3	2/18.2
	English Language Learners		0/0	1/14.3	2/28.6

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	23	20	33	12		25				
ELL	36	29		38	20		43				
BLK	38			38							
HSP	45	26	30	37	11	8	32				
MUL	50			55							
WHT	54	49	43	55	35	33	47				
FRL	44	37	33	43	24	24	34				
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	26	26	29	33	53	47	31				
ELL	32	42		36	30						
BLK	33	47		30	40						

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
HSP	47	48	61	50	52	29	53				
MUL	31	40		36	36						
WHT	56	40	35	52	50	38	59				
FRL	43	41	44	42	46	37	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	15	28	27	20	40	40	21				
ELL	14	50		36	38						
BLK	47			50							
HSP	50	52	38	41	35	26	42				
MUL	38	23		38	38						
WHT	56	51	42	53	42	33	56				
FRL	47	46	36	47	40	31	45				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	280
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	27
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students in the L25% subgroup for ELA and Math showed the lowest performance. In FY19 45% of the L25% students made learning gains and only 33% of the subgroup improved in ELA during FY21. In FY19 35% of the L25% math subgroups made learning gains and the group percentage decreased to 18% during FY21.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on third-quarter iReady diagnostic, FY19 FSA, and FY21 FSA figures, the L25 ELA and Math data components are the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The students have missed key instruction due to chronic absenteeism and/or online instruction. Intervention teachers were required to teach classes when homeroom instructors were absent and substitute teachers did not accept open positions. As a result, the intervention teachers were unavailable to provide small groups instruction and reduce the class sizes during the intervention blocks. Increased student/adult attendance, the discontinuation of online instruction, and the consistent utilization of intervention teachers to instruct L25% category students would aid in increasing the number making learning gains in ELA and Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the FY21 state assessment data, there was no improvement show in the seven categories. However, the ELA category showed only a 1% decrease from FY 2019 to FY 21.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

During the 2018-19 school year, the Academic Department, with input from teachers, created and made available Instructional Guides for each core subject area. Beginning FY19 teachers received implementation professional development and slowly began mastering the ELA content. In addition, several third, fourth, and fifth-grade teachers earned their reading endorsement. FY20 and 21 professional development continued and Reading PLCs were implemented with fidelity.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Daily targeted small group reading and math instruction would need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning. In addition, afterschool and one-on-one reading and math instruction would help accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

1. iReady training: Interpreting Data, Identifying Resources for Differentiated Instruction, and Progress Monitoring
2. Really Great Reading Training: Phonic
3. High-Yield Strategies Training: Modeling, Coaching, and Feedback
4. Reading and Math Instructional Guides Training: Implementation, Standards-based instruction, Coaching, Modeling, Feedback, Differentiated Instruction

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

1. Continue Really Great Reading, High-Yield Strategies, iReady, ELA, and Math training.
2. Continue weekly PLC meetings
3. Continue modeling, coaching, and providing feedback
4. Continue Plan, Do, Study, Act cycle of improvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: An average of thirty-three percent of the Black/African American, Multiracial, SWD, and ELL students made learning gains in the L25 category on the 2021 ELA standardized assessment, and 57% of the K-2 students made learning gains as measured by the Quarter 2 iReady Diagnostic assessment. Students across the grade levels struggled with foundational skills, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The students have missed key instruction due to chronic absenteeism and/or online instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will increase the percentage of Black/African American students making learning gains in the L25 category from 31% to 37%, Multiracial students making learning gains in the L25 category from 30% to 36%, Students with Disabilities making learning gains in the L25 category from 34% to 40%, and ELL students making gains in the L25 category from 37% to 42% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.

Monitoring: Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will use the iReady Baseline/Quarterly diagnostics and FY22 ELA FSA to monitor the percentage of Black/African American, Multiracial, SWD, and ELL students making learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dr. Denise Phillips-Luster (denisedp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: High-Yield Instructional Strategies:
 1. Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs
 2. Distributed Summarizing
 3. Text-Dependent Questioning
 4. Writing to Raise Achievement
 5. Higher-Order Thinking

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: High-Yield Instructional Strategies are researched-based practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies are implemented to support the students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using a Level 3 or Level 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge High-Yield Strategies can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive; filling phonics gaps, building student vocabulary, and ensuring students are using the newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade-level text.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers and paraprofessionals in the implementation of High-Yield Strategies
2. Monitor the implementation of High-Yield Strategies
3. Progress monitor using iReady Diagnostic assessments
4. Analyze student diagnostic data
5. Form Tier II and Tier III small groups
6. Utilize iReady Toolbox materials to provide differentiated small group instruction
7. Implement an afterschool tutoring program
8. Implement the Continuous Improvement Model (Plan, Do, Study, Act)

Person Responsible Dr. Denise Phillips-Luster (denisedp@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Forty-eight percent of the students made learning gains on the 2021 ELA standardized assessment and 49% of the K-2 students made learning gains as measured by the Quarter 2 iReady Diagnostic assessment. The percentage of 3 -5 students making learning gains in ELA has decreased from 54% in FY19 to 48% in FY21. Students across the grade levels struggled with foundational skills, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The students have missed key instruction due to chronic absenteeism and/or online instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will increase the percentage of students making learning gains from 48% to 54% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.

Monitoring: Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will use the iReady Baseline/Quarterly diagnostics and FY22 ELA FSA to monitor the percentage of Black/African American, Multiracial, SWD, and ELL students making learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dr. Denise Phillips-Luster (denisedp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: High-Yield Instructional Strategies:
 1. Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs
 2. Distributed Summarizing
 3. Text-Dependent Questioning
 4. Writing to Raise Achievement
 5, Higher-Order Thinking

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: High-Yield Instructional Strategies are researched-based practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies are implemented to support the students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using a Level 3 or Level 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge High-Yield Strategies can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive; filling phonics gaps, building student vocabulary, and ensuring students are using the newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade-level text.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers and paraprofessionals in the implementation of High-Yield Strategies
2. Monitor the implementation of High-Yield Strategies
3. Progress monitor using iReady Diagnostic assessments
4. Analyze student diagnostic data
5. Form Tier II and Tier III small groups
6. Utilize iReady Toolbox materials to provide differentiated small group instruction
7. Implement an afterschool tutoring program
8. Implement the Continuous Improvement Model (Plan, Do, Study, Act)

Person Responsible: Dr. Denise Phillips-Luster (denisedp@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) and Restorative Justice practices will be implemented with fidelity to reduced the number of infractions and out-of-school suspensions. We will communicate common expectations, implement targeted instruction for appropriate social and academic skills, define support strategies for classroom behavior expectations, provide positive reinforcement, work collaboratively, attend social-emotional learning professional development, and have data-driven dialogues to better inform our decision-making. Most importantly, we will empower our students to resolve conflicts on their own and in small groups.

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.

NA

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

NA

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00