

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Knights 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Knights Elementary School

4815 N KEENE RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Janine Hall

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 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* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%) |
| 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Knights Elementary School

4815 N KEENE RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[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 PK-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 | 54% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | B | B | 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.

Knights Elementary will be an informed, collaborative, community focused together on evidenced based practices which ensure that every student will grow into a successful leader of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Knights Elementary will work together as a team to ensure the success of every student.

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 |
|--------------|---------------------|---|
| Hall, Janine | Principal | Act in the role of instructional leader to facilitate discussion based on school improvement, improved teaching practice and student learning. |
| Way, Leanne | Assistant Principal | In partnership with the principal, act in the role of instructional leader to facilitate discussion based on school improvement, improved teaching practice and student learning. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/23/2018, Janine Hall

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.*

4

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

620

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 | 33 | 86 | 89 | 117 | 90 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 523 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 23 | 23 | 23 | 26 | 12 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |

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 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 41 | 38 | 19 | 34 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| 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 6/23/2021

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 | 102 | 125 | 106 | 111 | 108 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 657 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 102 | 125 | 106 | 111 | 108 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 657 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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 | | | | 49% | 52% | 57% | 49% | 52% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50% | 55% | 58% | 44% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 62% | 50% | 53% | 36% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 59% | 54% | 63% | 52% | 55% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 66% | 57% | 62% | 49% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60% | 46% | 51% | 39% | 44% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 47% | 50% | 53% | 52% | 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 | 56% | 52% | 4% | 58% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 55% | -19% | 58% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -56% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 54% | -3% | 56% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 54% | 8% | 62% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 53% | 57% | -4% | 64% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 54% | 3% | 60% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 51% | -5% | 53% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For math and Reading: I-Ready fall, winter and spring diagnostic testing.
 Science: Baseline and mid year Science test

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 16 | 32 | 49 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 | 32 | 49 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6 | 17 | 28 |
| | English Language Learners | 8 | 21 | 36 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 10 | 38 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3 | 10 | 24 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 | 10 | 24 |
| | English Language Learners | 6 | 20 | 26 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 23 | 52 | 64 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 8 | 16 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 | 13 | 21 |
| | English Language Learners | 7 | 19 | 36 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 6 | 41 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 8 | 26 |
| | English Language Learners | 2 | 22 | 41 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 34 | 49 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19 | 30 | 45 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 22 | 34 |
| | English Language Learners | 4 | 3 | 33 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 6 | 23 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6 | 15 | 28 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2 | 17 | 22 |
| | English Language Learners | 2 | 4 | 20 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 29 | 35 | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18 | 17 | 34 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| | English Language Learners | 4 | 12 | 11 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 16 | 22 | 40 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 | 18 | 33 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 7 | 24 |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 36 | 43 | 50 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33 | 35 | 49 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 16 | 16 | 17 |
| | English Language Learners | 24 | 20 | 26 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 14 | 36 | 70 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10 | 32 | 64 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 12 | 54 |
| | English Language Learners | 3 | 24 | 60 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 60 | 60 | |
| | 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 | 21 | 20 | 30 | 31 | 40 | 50 | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 33 | 17 | 41 | 58 | 50 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | 38 | 21 | 42 | 60 | 45 | 33 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 57 | 50 | 61 | 64 | 67 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 44 | 35 | 48 | 61 | 52 | 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 |
| SWD | 31 | 22 | 31 | 42 | 59 | 55 | 26 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 50 | 64 | 45 | 63 | 65 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 53 | 70 | 56 | 71 | 70 | 38 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 50 | 67 | 64 | 67 | 71 | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 50 | 62 | 54 | 65 | 58 | 42 | | | | |
| 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 | 35 | 31 | 47 | 28 | 37 | 47 | 26 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 28 | 36 | 36 | 47 | 47 | 11 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 39 | 38 | 47 | 47 | 46 | 46 | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 47 | 38 | 55 | 50 | 35 | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 41 | 35 | 46 | 47 | 37 | 46 | | | | |

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 | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 48 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 376 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |
| 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 | 37 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 40 |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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?

Math and reading continue to be a focus area for growth. The subgroups of SWD and ELL are scoring significantly lower than all students combined. This is true in all grade levels.

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

According to the 2019 data, the areas of ELL and SWD continue to be focus areas. In each grade level and in every subject these two subgroups present on average 20-40% below the overall scores of all students.

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

Students need high levels of individualized, specific instruction, that is directed at their level while still receiving overall instruction in all of the standards.

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

Growth was present in both reading and math for all students.

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

Differentiated instruction in all grade levels for all students.

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

Students require additional levels of multi-tiered support to accelerate their learning to the level that is necessary to meet or exceed the all students ratings.

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.

We will provide individualized PD opportunities that are tailor made for groups of teachers based on a specific data review and goal setting.

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

Hiring extra tutors to provide individual, differentiated, instruction. Layer instruction so that our highest need populations (ESE & ELL) receive four tiers of individualized instruction while still be accelerated in core instruction. Progress monitor all students especially those who are ELL or SWD.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores 39% in third grade and 44% in 4th grade scored at proficiency (Level 3 or higher). This score was due to students in e-learning, large numbers of students with absences, teacher absences and the need for students to receive additional layers of carefully planned instruction to compensate for lost learning. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include an increase in student talk, clarity of understanding and an increase in student ownership of work, differentiation and scaffolding to support diverse learners in addition to accelerating their core instruction.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of 3rd and 4th grade students scoring a 3 or higher will increase to 50% as measured by the FSA assessment.

Monitoring: Teachers will use progress monitoring and student led goal setting to monitor and drive the instructional focuses listed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize formative data to help plan for appropriate levels of scaffolding that will engage students collaboratively, increase student talk and make their learning visible.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was chosen to enable students to increase their ownership and clarity in the instructional practice.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate a mini-professional development on ways to scaffold students through the use of varying instructional delivery models based upon the work of Fisher and Frey. Purchase the book "This is Balanced Literacy" to provide to teachers as a guide. Meet with teachers regularly in ILT & PLC's to discuss data trends.

Person Responsible Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

Conduct walk throughs to collect evidence of look fors and lesson implementation. Provide feedback to teachers based on observations.

Person Responsible Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 ELA FSA Scores 38% in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored at proficiency, This score was due to instructional practices that did not provide enough scaffolding and instruction layered enough to meet the students with disabilities higher level of need.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of 3, 4, and 5th grade students with disabilities scoring at a 3 or higher on the FSA assessment will increase to 40%.

Monitoring: Students will be actively involved in progress monitoring of their own learning goals and instructional practice will implement a higher degree of layering additional supports to provide increased scaffolding where needed for students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use formative data to help plan for appropriate levels of additional scaffolding that will engage students collaboratively and make their learning visible.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students need additional layers of instruction to meet fill in the learning gaps they have amassed over the years.

Action Steps to Implement

The schedule of each student with disabilities will be carefully analyzed and created to include a 4th tier of support that aligns seamlessly with the expected standards and provides the additional instruction they need scaffolded to their level. These schedules will be monitored throughout the year and adjustments will be made as needed to ensure student success.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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 will continue to develop our character education program with a focus on SEL as a part of every classroom. We will monitor this instruction through discipline referrals, student attendance and achievement.

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.

Knights builds a positive culture through the use of a school wide social emotional learning program to develop and mentor character education. All stakeholders work together in this process, which is monitored and adjusted as needed for individual students and classrooms. Knights participates in many activities to further develop students including Say Hello Week, Student Senate which acts as a welcoming committee for new students, Daily SEL lessons, Say No to Drugs Week, etc.

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

- 1) Social services team consisting of Guidance, Social work and Psychology work with teachers to develop our school wide character education program. They also provide support in the classroom through visits, lessons and individual counseling.
- 2) Teachers take an active role in social emotional learning by providing daily opportunities for instruction through direct lessons, morning meetings and intervention

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |