

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Bay Crest 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Bay Crest Elementary School

4925 WEBB RD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Maltezos

Start Date for this Principal: 5/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Bay Crest Elementary School

4925 WEBB RD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

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 KG-5	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

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 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.

To provide a solid foundation that provides a culture for students to become life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be an exemplary school for students and staff by setting high expectations for responsibility, achievement, and empathy.

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
Falcone, Christina	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (Tier 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.
Maltezos, Lisa	Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (Tier 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.
Swanson, Linda	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (Tier 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 5/1/2014, Lisa Maltezos

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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

520

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

2

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

2

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	51	80	90	89	91	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	496
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	

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	1	8	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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

Wednesday 8/4/2021

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	110	108	72	108	132	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	10	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	14	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	10	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	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	110	108	72	108	132	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	10	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	14	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	10	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				50%	52%	57%	46%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	55%	58%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	50%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				41%	54%	63%	45%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				44%	57%	62%	50%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				25%	46%	51%	33%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				32%	50%	53%	47%	51%	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	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	54%	-27%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	31%	51%	-20%	53%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

IReady reading and math

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	47	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	61	73
	Students With Disabilities	44	50	67
	English Language Learners	25	27	49
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89	87	95
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	46	68
	Students With Disabilities	25	40	60
	English Language Learners	16	16	30
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	50	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	56	66
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	52	63	72
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	32	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	74	81	56
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	3	39	65

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	63	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	65	79
	Students With Disabilities	48	61	63
	English Language Learners	69	97	106
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	29	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	32	60
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	22
	English Language Learners		58	106
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	58	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	64	75
	Students With Disabilities	66	57	62
	English Language Learners	84	92	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24	31	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	33	53
	Students With Disabilities	33	53	73
	English Language Learners	49	34	49

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	65	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	62	68
	Students With Disabilities	83	83	77
	English Language Learners	29	43	29
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	39	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	36	42
	Students With Disabilities	96	58	108
	English Language Learners		20	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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	11	20		12			14				
ELL	49	43		37	26		25				
BLK	44			20							
HSP	49	50		40	29		41				
MUL	50										
WHT	54	60		44	55		55				
FRL	46	51	50	36	29	19	31				
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	16	49	62	18	29	20					
ELL	38	63	69	34	43	32	12				
BLK	46	60		23	28		17				

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	45	63	73	40	46	32	28				
MUL	67			42							
WHT	57	38		51	50		48				
FRL	45	56	63	36	45	27	33				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	37	42	27	46	50	24				
ELL	29	44	45	34	47	38	41				
BLK	34	35		17	25						
HSP	47	54	43	45	51	39	47				
MUL	54			54							
WHT	51	57		55	59	33	58				
FRL	43	53	44	42	50	35	44				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	39
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	32
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	37
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	50
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	54
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	39
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?

A vast majority of students enter below level with the contributing factor being a lack of math foundational skills leading to frustration and lack of engagement.

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

5th Grade FSA math and 1st and 3rd grade Iready math data. Formative data supports the FSA data. Students demonstrate learning gaps within foundational skills which lead to high frustration level in the content areas. Students lack of stamina also contributed to low performance.

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

FSA math. 27% of students passed on 2019 FSA compared to 60% statewide. Students are consistently low performing due to a gap in foundation skills. A deficit in small group instruction and differentiation is also a factor. Having small groups daily will decrease the gaps in foundation skills and will be able to meet the specific deficit areas.

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

Data from IReady... Why? Collaborative planning, differentiation, instructional practices, guided groups, and academic coaches.

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

ELP tutoring throughout the day was a factor in increasing math processes. Increase in math vocabulary was implemented schoolwide. Increased computer lab time to focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

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

Increase data chats to increase student ownership; increase targeted small group instruction for specific domain deficits; decrease the number of BL students who are 1 year below; increase math vocabulary - students use math vocabulary when explaining thinking, implement use of vocabulary school-wide, use turn and talk and small group instruction to increase vocabulary, post vocabulary on word wall with an explanation of the word

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. Provide and participate in Professional Development focused on HOT questions and differentiation (Purchase: resource books & materials, presenter/trainer) and Sanford Harmony (materials, facilitator)
2. Provide and participate in coaching cycles with the Academic Math Coach
3. Provide additional resource staff to support planning, differentiation/small groups, and additional needs based grouping specifically for Black and students with disabilities

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

Providing additional support for ELL students using Imagine Learning to increase their literacy skills in order to read and comprehend the math questions, as well as utilizing math manipulatives to increase understanding with paraprofessional. Implementing tier 2 instructional groups with math coach to close learning gaps in all grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 2021 4th grade and 5th grade FSA and IReady data, math is a critical need area. Using strategies to increase student engagement will lead to closing and preventing learning gaps. Strategies will include collaborative planning, small group differentiated instruction, use of exit tickets, hands on (manipulatives) and critical thinking activities (H.O.T questions), and creating a positive classroom environment.

Measurable Outcome: Engagement will be measured during walk throughs with 80% or more of the students involved in active learning activities, 80% will participate in STEAM activities including building challenges. 80% of students will increase engagement through use of exit tickets. 80% of students will show gains based on data collected on Data Wall. 80% of classrooms will have implemented community building activities such as Sanford Harmony, CHAMPS, Morning Meetings, etc.

Monitoring: Walk throughs using the RADAR tool

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Maltezos (lisa.maltezos@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: To increase engagement and student community, we will utilize collaborative planning to include targeted small group/differentiated instruction with a focus on hands on and critical thinking activities, the use of exit tickets, and community building activities (Sanford Harmony, CHAMPS, Morning meetings, etc).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are utilizing these strategies to increase engagement and close/prevent the learning gaps, and increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide and participate in Professional Development focused on HOT questions and differentiation (Purchase: resource books & materials, presenter/trainer) and Sanford Harmony (materials, facilitator)
2. Provide and participate in coaching cycles with Academic Math Coach
3. Provide additional resource staff to support planning, differentiation/small groups, and additional needs based grouping specifically for Black and students with disabilities.
4. Support student engagement and learning through STEAM implementation, and consumable resources to support all of the above

Person Responsible Lisa Maltezos (lisa.maltezos@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 49% in grade 3 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. 38% in grade 4 scored at proficiency, and 50% in grade 5 scored at proficiency. This score was due to lack of student engagement. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include increased planning with academic coach to increase student engagement resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on FSA ELA 2022.
Measurable Outcome:	Engagement will be measured during walk throughs with 80% or more of the students involved in active learning activities, 80% of students will increase engagement through use of exit tickets. 80% of students will show gains based on data collected on Data Wall. Grades 3 will be 55% proficiency, 4th grade 50% proficiency, and 5th grade 55% proficiency on ELA FSA 2022.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will be through IReady diagnostic, class walkthroughs, interim testing (reading and writing).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Maltezos (lisa.maltezos@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase engagement and student community, we will utilize collaborative planning to include targeted small group/differentiated instruction critical thinking activities, the use of exit tickets.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are utilizing these strategies to increase engagement and close/prevent the learning gaps, and increase student proficiency in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

HOT Questions professional development

Person Responsible Lisa Maltezos (lisa.maltezos@hcps.net)

Coaching cycles provided by reading coach

Person Responsible Lisa Maltezos (lisa.maltezos@hcps.net)

Develop plan to provide teachers with additional collaborative planning opportunities on a regular basis

Person Responsible Lisa Maltezos (lisa.maltezos@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.floridacims.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.

Our school is consistently implementing CHAMPS, Sanford Harmony, and regular guidance lessons to ensure students stay on track and learning is the main focus. Students remain in the classroom.

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.

We will build positive relationships with parents and families through our SAC meetings, PAC meetings to create positive interactions with our ELL families, educate and engage families in their student's learning through Parent and Family Involvement nights, data sharing conferences, and access to translation resources for our non-English speaking families. Community stakeholders will help fulfill the school mission through participation in our SAC committee.

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

Lisa Maltezos - Principal
 Linda Swanson - Assistant Principal
 Shelby Machart - Guidance Counselor
 Carolyn Delgado - ELL Resource Teacher
 Sophia Fidler - Parent/Family Engagement Liaison
 Christina Falcone - SAC Chair
 Classroom Teachers

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00