



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>31</b>

## Explorer K 8

10252 NORTHCLIFFE BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34608

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ek8>

### Demographics

**Principal: Lisa Braithwaite**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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 Hernando County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>31</b>

## Explorer K 8

10252 NORTHCLIFFE BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34608

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ek8>

### School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

### School Grades History

	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Year</b>				
<b>Grade</b>		C	C	C

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.**

All stakeholders in our community will work collaboratively to promote an environment of high expectations where all of our young explorers will have the opportunity to receive a quality, interactive education in a nurturing, safe and secure environment.

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

Explore today....Conquer tomorrow!

### 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
Braithwaite, Lisa	Principal	Oversees implementation of the School Improvement Plan to ensure fidelity.
Fischer, Jocelyn	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Title I ELA Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Weed, Donald	Administrative Support	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity. Also monitors and implements the PBIS system.
Roman, Jillian	Administrative Support	Assessment teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting all grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and reporting state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data for continuous monitoring of students achievement.
Schwartz, Eric	Assistant Principal	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
MacGregor, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Cuevas, Toni	Instructional Coach	Supports teachers by delivering Professional Development, providing resources, and engaging in the Coaching Cycle to assist teachers in providing rigorous and standards based instruction to students.
Washington, Terri	Administrative Support	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity. Also monitors and implements the PBiS system.
Baker, Donna	School Counselor	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity. Also monitors and implements student achievement as well as the social and emotional well being of the student body.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Lisa Braithwaite

**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.*

43

**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.*

64

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

117

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,604

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

10

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

8

**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	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/21/2021

**2020-21 - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

**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				47%	70%	61%	48%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	61%	59%	43%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	52%	54%	35%	48%	52%
Math Achievement				49%	70%	62%	54%	68%	61%
Math Learning Gains				49%	58%	59%	51%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	58%	52%	54%	57%	52%
Science Achievement				49%	60%	56%	50%	63%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				78%	83%	78%	68%	82%	77%

**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	54%	57%	-3%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	59%	-2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	52%	-15%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2021					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	50%	53%	-3%	52%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	38%	53%	-15%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	62%	-8%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2021					
	2019	42%	53%	-11%	55%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
07	2021					
	2019	61%	62%	-1%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
08	2021					
	2019	17%	50%	-33%	46%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	48%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	86%	67%	19%	67%	19%
<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	76%	75%	1%	71%	5%
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	72%	59%	13%	61%	11%
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Curriculum Associates i-Ready Progress Monitoring for Grades K-8 in Reading and Mathematics  
 SAM Science For AP1 and AP2 for Grades 5 and 8.  
 District Unify Assessment for Civics in Grade 7

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%	31%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	32%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	22%	45%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9%	20%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	20%	49%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	22%	57%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24%	51%	69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	51%	70%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	25%	48%
	English Language Learners	0%	22%	56%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12%	34%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	33%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	25%	43%
	English Language Learners	0%	5%	11%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53%	68%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	70%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	43%	48%
	English Language Learners	0%	57%	71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	33%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	34%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	10%	32%
	English Language Learners	0%	14%	67%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35%	40%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	40%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	13%	29%
	English Language Learners	36%	50%	36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18%	30%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	31%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	15%	21%
	English Language Learners	18%	36%	57%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26%	28%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	28%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	4%	4%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%	30%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	32%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	15%	25%
	English Language Learners	9%	31%	27%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0%	2%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39%	38%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	37%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	8%	4%
	English Language Learners	33%	40%	38%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20%	23%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	23%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	4%	4%
	English Language Learners	22%	0%	31%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33%	37%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	37%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	4%	17%
	English Language Learners	6%	18%	22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	21%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	21%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	13%	14%
	English Language Learners	8%	15%	6%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	0%	1%	5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	2%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32%	43%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	44%	42%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	11%	15%
	English Language Learners	7%	36%	36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2%	9%	8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1%	7%	6%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	4%	4%
	English Language Learners	0%	15%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

**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	16	36	33	22	45	44	13	32			
ELL	24	53	57	40	48	64	25	31			
ASN	45			82							
BLK	33	45	36	27	23	25	29	53			
HSP	35	43	37	40	41	45	33	51	56		
MUL	31	37		32	40						
WHT	47	44	37	43	40	47	45	55	67		
FRL	36	41	36	36	38	43	37	49	55		
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	18	40	38	23	44	42	14	60			
ELL	24	39	50	29	54	56	30	64			

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
ASN	67	54		73	62						
BLK	38	50	55	40	46	35	38	73			
HSP	41	50	44	41	48	49	41	74	48		
MUL	34	51	57	31	52	73	53	67			
WHT	53	52	52	56	50	53	55	81	41		
FRL	44	50	50	45	47	50	44	73	38		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	31	26	27	50	48	37	19			
ELL	10	45	48	31	55	68	17				
ASN	67	70		73	60						
BLK	40	21	23	39	41	46	26	55			
HSP	43	42	36	49	50	61	43	62	59		
MUL	49	47		45	54	50	53	64			
WHT	51	45	38	59	52	53	56	73	32		
FRL	44	40	37	51	48	53	48	63	36		

### 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	46
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	47
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

I-Ready Progress Monitoring Data shows:

The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in ELA and Math begins to drop in Grades 5-8.

Females show a greater percentage of proficiency and growth than males in grades 3-8.

Students who experienced 'in person' learning demonstrated a greater percentage of growth than students participating in daily courses through Microsoft teams at home.

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

Students who exhibit the greatest need for improvement are digital students returning to the school environment for 2021-22, and students in 5th-8th grade who historically demonstrate minimal growth from AP1-AP3 in iReady diagnostic assessments for ELA and Math. Additionally, students in Grade 7 are demonstrating only 37% proficient in Reading, indicating 63% may have difficulty reading and interpreting the 7th grade Civics EOC.

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

With students being given the option to remain at home for the digital learning experience, and also being quarantined for extended periods of time, many students were unable to retain and maintain expected annual progress under these circumstances. Students will need to be evaluated early, and systematically remediated to close the gaps created by the inconsistent nature of the school setting in 2020-2021. Students will be strategically placed into intensive Ready and Math courses, as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups to address the gaps showing present after AP1 diagnostics and screenings. Teachers will need to plan collaboratively, with the knowledge of their student needs forefront during these planning sessions.

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

English Language Learners in Grades K-4 demonstrated an average of 50.3% growth from AP1 to AP3 in Grades K-4 in ELA.

Students with disabilities in Grades K-4 exhibited an average of 41.2% growth from AP1 to AP3 in Grades K-4 in ELA and Math.

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

Classroom and Inclusion teachers, as well as self contained ESE teachers were required to closely monitor SWD progress through the Student Work Analysis Protocol, team meetings, and Tiered Interventions. Teachers reported to the MTSS Coordinator, who assisted in establishing the correct protocols and remediation for students at risk.

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

Teachers and support staff will closely monitor student progress through Diagnostic Assessments, Formative and Summative Assessments, Standard's Mastery, then engage in making adjustments and designing lessons/interventions to meet the needs of the individual learners present in classrooms. Through carefully sculpted collaborative planning sessions, student work analysis protocols, data analysis and the development of student relationships, teachers will close the gaps of students who have been absent from classrooms, and those who demonstrate need of additional support.

**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.**

Weekly collaborative planning sessions provided during PLC's, Curriculum Associates iReady trainings, Thinking Maps, Sonday Systems, Wonders and Amplify Reading Curriculum, PBis, and social-emotional learning trainings will equip teachers to provide effective use of resources, quality lessons, and student centered groups, behavior supports, and differentiate instruction.

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

Teachers and students will receive additional support through Title 1 Resource teachers through the 'push-in' and 'pull-out' models in grade levels and with students indicating greatest need of interventions after analysis of Diagnostic, summative, formative, and standard's mastery data. Collaborative planning sessions will be designed to address the areas of focus which need additional attention after data analysis. Teachers will be demonstrating effective knowledge of students through evidence of data, parent communication, and lesson design as noted through Administrative walkthroughs and data chats.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The data from FL RtI:B indicates that 87% of Explorer's students had 0-1 Office Discipline Referrals, 9% of students had 2-5 discipline referrals, and 4% of students had 6+ discipline referrals. For the students receiving multiple referrals, there has been no system to effectively place students in Tier 2 supports, track students' progress and dismiss students when they are no longer in need of support. By establishing a systematic method to identify students needing Tier 2 interventions, they can receive the targeted support necessary to move them back into Tier 1. Through this process, repeated referrals will decrease.

**Measurable Outcome:** By establishing a system in which students needing Tier 2 behavioral supports are entered, monitored and exited from the program, the percentage of students receiving 6+ Office Discipline Referrals will decrease from 4% to 3% (64 students to 48 students) for the 2021-2022 school year.

**Monitoring:** The Discipline Referral data, RTi:B Committee recommendations/meeting notes, student progress reports, and parent communication logs will be monitored by Administration and Teachers on Administrative Assignment bimonthly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Donald Weed (weed\_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Explorer K-8 will create a system in which students with multiple discipline referrals will be entered, monitored and exited through Tier 2 behavioral supports.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If a systematic plan is in place for students needing Tier 2 behavioral supports, students will more effectively receive a carefully designed intervention, with increased attention being given to frequency, duration and efficacy of the student support. Ultimately, students will be able to exit Tier 2 and thrive in the Tier 1 instructional setting, having received the supports needed.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Create an RtI:B Committee which includes Guidance Counselors, MTSS coordinator, Teachers on Administrative Assignment, and Assistant Principal.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

RTi:B Committee will develop a Tier 2 monitoring checklist and calendar for bimonthly monitoring meetings.

**Person Responsible** Donald Weed (weed\_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Direct the Office Discipline Referral data entry personnel to notify TOAA when a student has received 5 referrals.

**Person Responsible** Donald Weed (weed\_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

TOAA will notify all parents of students who will be discussed at the RTi:B committee meeting, with an invitation to attend either virtually or in person.

**Person Responsible** Donald Weed (weed\_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Rti:B Committee will use RTiB checklist and referral data to problem solve, deciding whether adjustments should be made in Tier 1, or a specific Tier 2 intervention should be initiated for each student with 5 referrals.

**Person Responsible** Donald Weed (weed\_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Rti:B Committee will continue to meet bimonthly to discuss student entry, progress, response to intervention, adjustments necessary, and exiting of students engaged in all Tier 2 behavioral supports. Rti:B Committee will attend trainings as recommended by administration.

**Person Responsible** Donald Weed (weed\_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**

At the end of the year, iReady ELA Diagnostic results indicated that 22% of students assessed were at risk of Tier 3 interventions (13% of those 3 or more grade levels below), 25% of students were Tier 2, and 53% of students were Tier 1 (31% of those mid or above grade level).

In Math, the end of year iReady Diagnostic indicated that 19% of students were at risk of Tier 3 interventions (11% of those 3 or more grade levels below), 36% of students were Tier 2, and 45% of students were Tier 1 (25% of those mid or above grade level).

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Additionally, the iReady diagnostic data indicated that only 47% of students achieved 100% of their typical annual growth, with a mere 25% of students meeting the stretch growth needed to close grade level gaps in ELA. Similarly, Math data reported only 49% achieved typical growth, with 23% meeting the stretch needed to close grade level gaps.

In order to increase the percentage of students achieving typical and stretch growth, and to ensure that ALL students continue to grow from diagnostic to diagnostic, instructional staff will be asked to focus on demonstrating knowledge of students, including levels of cognitive development, cultural heritages, range of interests, economic and family status, special needs, disabilities, and historical achievement data/trends during PLC's and collaborative planning sessions.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By demonstrating a deeper knowledge of students through artifact building activities during PLC's and by making student centered decisions, Explorer K-8 will increase the percentage of students achieving 100% of typical annual growth to 55% for both ELA and Math. This would show an 8% increase in ELA, and a 6% increase in Math, as indicated by the 2022 AP3 iReady Diagnostics.

Explorer K-8 will also increase the percentage of students achieving 100% of their annual stretch growth to 30% in both ELA and Math. This would show a 5% increase in ELA, and a 7% increase in Math, as indicated by the 2022 AP3 iReady Diagnostics .

**Monitoring:**

Administration will monitor the i-Ready diagnostic data after each delivery, noting students making typical annual growth, as well as students closing gaps through stretch growth. Administrators will use this data to facilitate discussions with grade level groups during PLC's, and to problem solve with individual teachers and students as needed when iReady growth is not being demonstrated.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Weekly Professional Learning Communities and collaborative teacher planning sessions will specifically focus on increasing the teacher's knowledge of students by gathering data, sharing noteworthy findings, and making student centered decisions. As teachers' knowledge of students' cognitive ability, cultural heritage, special needs, disabilities, interests, family, and history increases, so will their ability to effectively engage students in meaningful lessons, build bridges between family and school, and help students achieve the high expectations of their grade level and beyond.

**Rationale for Evidence-**

Explorer K-8 has experienced Positive Behavior Support success in promoting, implementing, and monitoring student behavior using teacher PLC's once a month to monitor data and problem solve using student centered decision making processes. The

**based Strategy:** Professional Learning Community has proven to be a powerful venue for promoting schoolwide change, and will be used as a valuable resource as we increase our knowledge of students and close grade level gaps.

### Action Steps to Implement

Develop a schedule of PLC's which focus on building teachers' knowledge of students.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Develop PLC collaborative activities which require teachers to use their knowledge of students to build differentiated and standard's based lesson plans.

**Person Responsible** Susan Rivera (rivera\_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Monitor teacher's lesson delivery with a focus on their differentiated instruction through administrative walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Provide training to empower teachers to seek to improve their professional practice through collaboration, lesson planning, and data analysis.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

According to Rti:B 2018-2019 data (the last full of year of data pre-pandemic), Explorer K-8 was processing an average of 12.37 behavioral office referrals each day. Estimating that each referral takes approximately 1 hour to investigate, process, establish parent contact, and assign a meaningful intervention or response to the behavior, there is not enough time in the day for administrators and counselors to meet student needs. Upon reflection on this data, location, time of day, and type of infraction, it was decided that teachers needed to be equipped to effectively circumvent behavior issues by using specific and strategic Tier 1 procedures during classroom instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By supporting teachers and students during Tier I instruction through positive behavior reinforcement, culture building activities, trainings, attendance recognition and monitoring, the average daily referral data will decrease from 12.37 referrals per day to 8.

**Monitoring:**

The Leadership Team will monitor average number of daily referrals, the number of students participating in Tier 1 rewards and activities, and the number unable to participate due to behavior infractions. Analyzing this data by grade level and teacher will indicate where the team needs to focus their support, giving teachers additional strategies to increase the effective use of PBiS in their classrooms.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Donald Weed (weed\_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

The Leadership Team will meet with grade level teams during their planning once per month to discuss PBiS data, identifying locations, times of day, and types of behavior occurring to problem solve strategies to address the behaviors at a Tier 1 level.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

If teachers are given added support and opportunities to learn from school leadership and their peers, they will have additional strategies to address behaviors before they reach the level needing an office referral.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Establish a PBiS team with representatives from PreK - 8th grade and Guidance Counselors to meet monthly. They will report to grade level teams the decisions and initiatives from PBiS leadership, and report their grade level responses to the initiatives at each meeting.

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Provide training for the PBiS team and the faculty to empower teachers to use Positive Behavior Supports, plan engaging lessons, and find effective ways to build relationships with students and their families.

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Establish a common area for PBiS meetings, rewards, and trainings.

**Person Responsible**

Jillian Roman (roman\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Develop a school-wide system of PBiS rewards, assemblies, and activities per grade using student input and feedback to develop engaging events.

**Person Responsible**

Donald Weed (weed\_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Display PRIDE expectations and announce them daily to the school, with teachers addressing the goals of Positivity, Reliability, Inspiration, Determination and Empowerment in their classrooms and throughout campus.

**Person Responsible** Jillian Roman (roman\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Introduce Guidance Counselors to all elementary students by placing Guidance on the specials rotation wheel during August and September to teach social and behavioral skills. This will also allow Guidance Counselors to get to know the student with whom they might need to place in a Tiered intervention.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#### #4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In the 2018-2019 school year, Explorer K-8 demonstrated 35% of students with disabilities showing proficiency in ELA, well below the ESSA benchmark of 41%.

**Measurable Outcome:** EK8's goal for our students with disabilities in ELA would be to show 41% proficiency, an increase of 6% from our current score of 35% proficient.

**Monitoring:** To monitor the progress of Explorer K-8 students with disabilities, subgroups will be created within iReady by the Assessment teacher. All SWD filtered assessment data, including growth monitoring, standard's mastery, and diagnostics will be printed for administrators and teachers to discuss during post assessment PLC's.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will discuss students with disability data as a part of their team Student Work Analysis Protocol process. Teachers will then collaborate to set goals for the SWD and discuss alternative strategies as a part of the team SWAP.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** When teachers are actively focusing on the data collection around the SWD subgroup of students, they will become more aware of the student growth or stagnation. If teachers are provided with opportunities to report this SWD data and collaborate on strategies that move students toward growth, instructional effectiveness and student scores will increase.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Maintain a section in the Student Work Analysis Protocol document which specifically asks teachers to report to their teams indicating how their SWD's are performing in relation to the rest of the class.
2. Teachers will add this discussion to their team meetings when analyzing student work.
3. The assessment teacher will collect SWAP data to share with teams.
4. Teams will celebrate student growth.

**Person Responsible** Jillian Roman (roman\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Upon review of the 20-21 FSA ELA data, 50% or more of all students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade scored below Level 3. While 49% of the 3rd grade students, 41% of the 4th grade students, and 39% of the 5th grade students scored a Level 3 or above in ELA we are identified in the ESSA category as TS&I for our school type 04. Consequently, Explorer K-8 will focus on purposeful and collaborative planning and prediction practices among grade level teams during weekly Professional Learning Communities to increase the percentage of student demonstrating grade level proficiency. Part of this process will include the inclusion of concept mapping during ELA instruction, using Thinking Maps as an instructional strategy that supports and promotes reading comprehension and retention. <https://www.thinkingmaps.com/cdn/WhitePaperBuildingBlocksofBrainBasedLearning.pdf>

**Measurable Outcome:** Explorer K-8 will increase the percentage of ELA proficiency for the 2022 statewide assessment ( FSA ) by 3% to  
 52% of 3rd grade students (3% increase from 2nd grade)  
 52% of 4th grade students (3% increase from 3rd grade)  
 44% of 5th grade students (3% increase from 4th grade)

**Monitoring:** i-Ready ELA Diagnostic Data and iReady Standards Mastery Data will be disaggregated and evaluated in order to be able to assist teachers with effective lesson plans and concept mapping. Areas of instructional focus and intentional concept maps will be present in lesson plans and student displays.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers at Explorer K-8 will engage in the teaching and instructional focus strategy of Planning and Prediction, in combination with the research based instructional strategy of concept mapping throughout the lesson to support comprehension and provide visual cues to enhance retention. Teachers will collaborate during their weekly grade level Professional Learning Community sessions using a planning template that focuses on student needs and progress toward grade level benchmarks, choosing the Thinking Map that supports the cognitive processing needed to attain mastery of Benchmarks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Planning and Prediction has a .76 rating of effectivity indicating a potential to accelerate student learning considerably. (Hattie, Visible Learning+, 2015)  
 Concept Mapping has a .64 rating of effectivity indicating a potential to accelerate student learning considerably. (Hattie, Visible Learning+, 2015).

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will collaborate during their weekly grade level Professional Learning Community sessions using a planning template that focuses on student needs and progress toward grade level benchmarks.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will collaborate as grade level teams to choose the Thinking Map that supports the cognitive processing needed to attain mastery of Benchmarks.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite\_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

## 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.

**According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org dashboard, Explorer K-8 ranks very high in the following areas:**

**Violent Incidents, showing 3.01 per 100 students,  
Drug/Public Order Incidents, showing 1.36 per 100 students, and  
Suspensions: 13.6 suspensions per 100 students.**

**EK8's Goal of reducing the number of daily referrals from 12.37 referrals / day to 8 includes a building a strategic system whereby students receiving multiple referrals will receive targeted behavior interventions through carefully matched mentors and check-in/checkout procedures, as well as equipping teachers to address behavior issues effectively during Tier 1 instruction.**

### 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.

Explorer K-8 is a Title I school and works hard to foster positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. Regular print and digital communication includes automated calls, flyers, backpack notices and our website. We use Facebook and Twitter to inform our community about school activities, achievements, initiatives and invite community feedback. Explorer K-8 also convenes monthly School Advisory Council and Title I Committee meetings to hear stakeholder input relevant to school improvement and parent concerns. Explorer K-8 also convenes a Title I Annual Meeting, hosts parent conferences throughout the year, and fosters parental engagement through parent workshops such as grade level curriculum nights.

From the beginning of the school year, Explorer K-8 begins to develop positive relationships and open communication between parents and teachers. School communication folders and agendas along with Remind and Class DoJo apps are used to communicate academic and behavioral progress daily. Community partners are invited to larger parent events to increase school community awareness of community service providers and provide families with access to information and resources.

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

Explorer K-8 establishes partnerships with businesses including our neighboring McDonalds, Twistee Treat, Winn Dixie, YMCA, as well as People Helping People and Operation Heart F.E.L.T. Community stakeholders such as Operation Heart F.E.L.T and People Helping People provide weekend food backpacks to our students as well.

Explorer Students interact with the community through Student Council and community volunteer projects. Parents also participate in the development and revision of the Title I Compact and Title I Parent and Family Engagement Plan. The plan is distributed to parents at the Title I Annual Meeting and sent home by backpack to parents who are not able to attend the Title I Annual Meeting. The Title I Compact encourages and sets expectations between students, parents, and teachers.

Explorer K-8 also fosters a positive school climate for students and teachers as a PBIS school. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student and teacher outcomes every day.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>