Lanier Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lanier Elementary School

4704 W MONTGOMERY AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Moon   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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

Lanier Elementary School

4704 W MONTGOMERY AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[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	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

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.

The Lanier Elementary community will foster leadership skills while facilitating an education to develop each child to their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lanier's students will become lifetime learners and leaders who are prepared for life.

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
Garcia, Sarah	Principal	The leadership team meets weekly to drive the work of the School Improvement Plan. We meet on Mondays to progress monitor each of our goals, objectives and action steps. The Leadership team also serves as the Problem Solving Team to identify barriers to success towards each goal and create strategies to overcome each barrier. The principal's primary responsibility as an instructional leader is to ensure that our teaching and learning on campus are happening at a highly effective level every day. Daily walkthrough and regular feedback, along with targeted professional development are critical to achieving success for all students. Ensuring a safe and caring environment are equally critical to our student success and serves as a primary role for the principal.
Gattullo, Kristen	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal's primary responsibility as an instructional leader is to ensure that our teaching and learning on campus are happening at a highly effective level every day. Daily walkthrough and regular feedback, along with targeted professional development are critical to achieving success for all students. Ensuring a safe and caring environment are equally critical to our student success and serves as a primary role for the principal.
Scudder, Meagan	School Counselor	The school counselor leads our Student Service team and is primarily responsible for fostering a safe, caring and positive school environment. Facilitating social emotional learning is one of her main duties along with small group interventions, facilitating child study team meetings, and working with students who need additional support.
Millis, Maria	Staffing Specialist	The Staff Specialist works with our ESE students and teacher to ensure that the IEP goals are met. Duties include scheduling for ESE students, holding IEP meetings, and leading the planning for ESE services.
WIlliams, Lori	Math Coach	The Math Coach is critical to the success of teaching and learning related to math. Duties include: facilitating weekly collaborative planning with each grade level team, supporting in class instruction through modeling, co-teaching, or observation/feedback cycles, and small group instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Kevin Moon

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.*
19

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

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

340

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

3

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

3

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	52	57	51	57	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	2	7	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	9	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

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	53	61	56	61	66	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	356
Attendance below 90 percent	5	3	3	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	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	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	

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	53	61	56	61	66	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	356
Attendance below 90 percent	5	3	3	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	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	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	

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				53%	52%	57%	50%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	55%	58%	57%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	50%	53%	61%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	54%	63%	57%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	57%	62%	57%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	46%	51%	39%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	50%	53%	50%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	47%	51%	-4%	53%	-6%
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,
science district baseline, formative and SSA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	67	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	63	83
	Students With Disabilities	29	67	67
	English Language Learners	29	67	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	64	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	59	80
	Students With Disabilities	43	50	67
	English Language Learners	29	83	83

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40	60	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	55	61
	Students With Disabilities	38	38	38
	English Language Learners	14	29	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	52	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	44	61
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	51
	English Language Learners	0	29	29

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	56	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	48	60
	Students With Disabilities	33	46	67
	English Language Learners	67	40	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	30	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	23	52
	Students With Disabilities	8	31	58
	English Language Learners	0	20	80

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	31	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	27	31
	Students With Disabilities	23	24	37
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	16	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	8	60
	Students With Disabilities	14	19	59
	English Language Learners	0	0	80

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	26	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	22	28
	Students With Disabilities	14	24	37
	English Language Learners	20	25	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	33	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	30	50
	Students With Disabilities	21	33	48
	English Language Learners	20	50	75
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	44	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	55	41
	Students With Disabilities	33	36	12
	English Language Learners	41	40	33

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	48	60	41	70	90	17				
ELL	56			63							
BLK	30	36		43	50		23				
HSP	31	62		62	69		25				
MUL	54			62							
WHT	74	48		78	65		55				
FRL	48	52	57	59	63	92	41				
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	20	38	47	15	42	50	17				
ELL	9			27							
BLK	35	44		29	39		20				

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	38	60		40	56		37				
MUL	67			50							
WHT	66	61		59	61		75				
FRL	48	59	60	44	52	42	32				

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	18	39	55	31	36	18					
ELL	36			55	80						
BLK	36	36		36	50						
HSP	49	63		59	63		47				
MUL	39	73		47	10						
WHT	56	53		66	63		65				
FRL	44	54	58	51	55	40	45				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	36
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	51
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	58
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	64
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	60
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 Achievement in grades 3-5 increased significantly in 2021. Through use of data driven instructional techniques, our 3rd grade math achievement increased from 38% proficiency to 75%. In 4th grade, 62% of students met proficiency (12% increase) and in 5th grade 54% of students met proficiency. Also, 92% of our bottom quartile met learning gains.

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

Science Achievement in grades 5 stayed low at 44% of students scoring a L3+. Also, reading proficiency maintained similar to 2019 with overall proficiency of 51% and learning gains of 55% (BQ 62%).

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

We believe that there is a misalignment between ELA and science assessments to classroom instruction. This year we will implement data-driven instructional techniques that proved to be successful in math and use them in ELA and science. For example, monthly progress monitoring with common assessments that are aligned to the rigor of the standards and allow us to analyze for misconceptions and re-teach concepts that were not mastered.

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

Math Achievement in grades 3-5 increased significantly in 2021. Through use of data driven instructional techniques, our 3rd grade math achievement increased from 38% proficiency to 75%. In 4th grade, 62% of students met proficiency (12% increase) and in 5th grade 54% of students met proficiency. Also, 92% of our bottom quartile met learning gains.

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

The use of data-driven instructional techniques to analyze common assessments, create action plans for re-teaching of concepts that were not mastered, and the use of aggressive monitoring of students to constantly monitor student learning and provide targeted instruction based on data.

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

Use of scaffolding to provide on grade level text as much as possible, previewing concepts in small group instruction prior to teaching them, and consistent spiral review of concepts in order to retain

learning. We are implementing several strategies from the Driven by Data in order to provide targeted whole group and small group instruction based on assessment analysis results.

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 the following opportunities for Professional Development this year:
Driven by Data PD (series of 3 trainings after school)
Learning walks to observe colleagues using Data-driven instruction strategies
Books studies on The Knowledge Gap and Student Inquiry Assessment Edition
Lesson Study cycles for each grade level
Individual 1:1 teacher/admin coaching cycles to review student data and create action plans for student learning

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

Social-Emotional Learning through Leader in Me curriculum
Goal setting and data tracking for all students
Math Coach support in planning and small group instruction
Frequent classroom observations with feedback cycles (4 per quarter for each teacher)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Collaborative planning allows us to analyze student data from common interim assessments and plan for differentiated, targeted instruction that meets the needs of all students. Collaborative planning will take place weekly by grade level and will be facilitated by the Leadership Team.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will improve from 51% to 62% and Science proficiency will increase from 44% to 62% as measured by the FSA assessments in May 2022.
Monitoring:	Monthly progress monitoring through common math, science and ELA assessments will allow us to monitor all student progress and implement necessary interventions as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data-driven instructional strategies that allow us to plan for and provide targeted instruction that meets the needs of all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that data-driven instruction allows teachers to target specific needs of students and utilize strategies such as aggressive monitoring, small group instruction, spiral and reteach in order to ensure that students master content standards. We are using the work from the book, Driven by Data.

Action Steps to Implement	

Plan and organize monthly ELA and science assessments, to include:
1. Create calendar for monthly math assessments for each grade level
2. Schedule PLC meetings each month to analyze assessment results and create action plans to address student learning needs.
3. Organize, copy, and distribute assessments for each grade every month.

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Create Systems to facilitate data analysis related to math monthly assessments, to include:
1. Create student goal setting and progress monitoring forms
2. Create online data spreadsheets to monitor student progress each month
3. Create agenda and data analysis forms to facilitate PLCs and dig deep into the data (item analysis, trends, misconceptions, action plan, etc.)

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Aggressively monitor ESSA subgroups performing below required federal index. These subgroups include SWD, ELL and Black. During weekly collaborative planning, teachers will track i-ready minutes and pass rates, along with gains from any recent assessments during the week prior. Data scoreboards will be updated and problem solving to identify barrier to success along with strategies to break barriers. Planning for small group instruction to include reteaching, spiral review, and acceleration will target the needs of these subgroups based on weekly data.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Literacy is the heart of education and can be integrated into all subject areas. If literacy scores improve, all students will be better prepared for college and career. At Lanier, our ELA score increases have been minimal over the last 5 years. We seek to improve ELA planning and instruction in order to provide all students with high quality instruction in reading and writing that aligns with the state standards and best practices of literacy instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will improve from 51% to 62% as measured by the FSA assessments in May 2022.
Monitoring:	weekly administrative observation and feedback cycles, monthly ELA assessment data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	targeted, small group instruction that provides acceleration to students in order to address their academic needs while also maintaining high expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We know that many students at our school have significant learning gaps that need to be addressed. Small group re-teaching and using below grade level text will not provide the rigorous instruction needed to close the gaps. Therefore, we will implement acceleration strategies to scaffold and support students with accessing grade level text in order to meet their needs while keeping high academic expectations for all.

Action Steps to Implement

Create common assessments for ELA monthly. Each team will implement the following steps for each monthly common assessment:
-Meet 1 week prior to the assessment to preview the test and predict performance
-Provide adequate time and environment for testing, as well as accomodations for those who need them
-Meet within 72 hrs of each assessment to share data analysis findings (item analysis, action plans, next steps).
-Hold data chats and allow time for students to reflect on their performance

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Provide PD on "The Knowledge Gap" through a 4 session Book Study.

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Provide PD through learning walk cycles 3 times per year to observe other ELA teachers and provide peer coaching and feedback.

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Meet weekly in Common Planning to unpack units of study, state standards, and backwards plan daily instruction as grade level teams.

Person Responsible	Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Lanier Elementary School ranked in the high risk category when compared to other school, with the majority of incidents falling into the violence category. However, one rationale for this ranking is that there were 6 incidents and because we are a small school with enrollment of approx. 375 the percentage per pupil is inflated. Another rationale is that we host ESE self-contained units on our campus specifically for Behavior Support and the majority of our incidents are reported in relation to these units as we continue to work on teaching behavior. Our Leader in Me program allows us to foster a positive and safe school environment and encourage a sense of belonging for all students. Our school culture Insight survey data supports that we have a positive learning environment where students feel safe.

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.

At Lanier, we place a strong emphasis on a positive school culture. We received an overall composite score of 94% on the 2021 ASQi culture survey, one of the highest rated in the district. The 2021-22 school year will begin our 7th year of implementation with Franklin Covey's Leader in Me program, a school-wide transformational process that focus on leadership, culture, and academics. Lanier was recently named a Leaders in Me Lighthouse School, one of 400 exemplar models for the school worldwide. This process allows us to address daily social-emotional lessons that are rooted in the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, hold daily morning meetings in each classroom to build and strengthen classroom culture, and allow all stakeholders to have a voice in school-wide decision making. Each student participates in the 4 Disciplines of Execution goal setting process, where they set individual academic goals and monitor their own progress towards these goals. We also provide our staff annual training to empower student leadership and foster student-centered learning in each classroom.

According to our Measurable Results Survey results (performed by Franklin Covey), two areas we have identified to improve for the 2021-22 school year are School Belonging (rated 66/100) and Industry and Perseverance (rated 57/100). We will provide staff development on both of these topics to allow teachers to have specific strategies and action plans to address both of these areas, as well as monitor our progress through quarterly student surveys.

Finally, in order to continue to encourage family involvement and parent voice, we will create our first ever

Parent Lighthouse Team. This group of parents will meet monthly to support to the work of the school in all 3 areas (academics, leadership, culture) and provide feedback and suggestions for school improvement.

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

School Leadership/Lighthouse Team- The School Lighthouse Teams consists of 20 staff members and drives the work of the Leader in Me program. Each of Lighthouse members have shared leadership roles to facilitate monthly Action Team meetings. Every staff member is a member of a action team, and these teams focus on promotion of positive school culture and learning environment. These action teams meet monthly to set goals, monitor progress, seek feedback, and take action to improve the the school.

Action Teams include:
Student Lighthouse
Shared Leadership
Physical * Emotional School Environment
Adult Learning and Modeling
Parent and Community Involvement
Student-led Events

Parent Lighthouse Team-
This year, our SAC team will also serve as our Parent Lighthouse Team to provide valuable stakeholder input on overall school improvement and initiatives. The Parent Lighthouse Team will meet monthly to set goals, monitor progress, give and receive feedback and create new initiatives that benefit the school.

Community Partnerships-
Grace Family Church is a close community partner for us. This year they will host 2 Beautification Days on campus, provide mentors to at-risk students, donate school supplies, and provide tutors for our KG students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00