

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Limona 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 | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Limona Elementary School

1115 TELFAIR RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marlou Bates

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 97% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (63%) |
| 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 |

Limona Elementary School

1115 TELFAIR RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[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 | No | 57% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 68% |

School Grades History

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

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.

Limona will build a positive, academically challenging and safe environment for students to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Limona students will be prepared to succeed in 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 |
|-------------------|----------------|--|
| Bates, Marlou | Principal | Monitor data, coach teachers, facilitate curriculum discussions, and provide professional learning opportunities |
| French, JeanMarie | SAC Member | Review data and provide teacher's with ELA resources as needed |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Marlou Bates

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.*

2

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

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

597

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 | 91 | 93 | 108 | 115 | 86 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 597 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 12/2/2021

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 | 93 | 101 | 94 | 95 | 102 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 578 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 14 | 6 | 7 | 15 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 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 | 93 | 101 | 94 | 95 | 102 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 578 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 14 | 6 | 7 | 15 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 66% | 52% | 57% | 68% | 52% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 55% | 58% | 56% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35% | 50% | 53% | 45% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 69% | 54% | 63% | 73% | 55% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 52% | 57% | 62% | 50% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48% | 46% | 51% | 33% | 44% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 58% | 50% | 53% | 55% | 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 | 62% | 52% | 10% | 58% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 55% | 7% | 58% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 54% | 14% | 56% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 54% | 21% | 62% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 63% | 57% | 6% | 64% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -75% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 54% | 4% | 60% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 51% | 4% | 53% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

- 1-5 -iReady
- 5 - Science Baseline

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 47% | 81% | 91% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31% | 48% | 69% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 41% | 69% | 82% |
| | English Language Learners | 86% | 85% | 100% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 31% | 70% | 89% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21% | 36% | 71% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13% | 36% | 51% |
| | English Language Learners | 40% | 0% | 80% |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 75% | 84% | 91% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47% | 68% | 77% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 62% | 64% | 57% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 45% | 68% | 91% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15% | 39% | 67% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 39% | 81% | 90% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 72% | 80% | 99% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 64% | 76% | 84% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 50% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 40% | 69% | 91% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31% | 59% | 77% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 21% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 63% | 87% | 89% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40% | 51% | 62% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 59% | 72% | 89% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 35% | 42% | 60% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 100% | 100% | 80% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 55% | 61% | 72% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 32% | 38% | 45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 70% | 50% | 100% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 46% | 61% | 79% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21% | 41% | 53% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 72% | 67% | 93% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 70.70% | 74.21% | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 53.7% | 41.88% | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 73.45% | 57.85% | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 23 | | | 35 | | | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 55 | | 52 | 45 | | 27 | | | | |
| ASN | 78 | | | 83 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | 48 | | 39 | 38 | | 32 | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 40 | | 59 | 35 | | 30 | | | | |
| MUL | 79 | | | 93 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 61 | | 75 | 50 | | 65 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 48 | 35 | 59 | 40 | 44 | 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 | 27 | 27 | 19 | 42 | 41 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 56 | 63 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 63 | | | | | |
| ASN | 93 | 82 | | 93 | 92 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 48 | 33 | 63 | 45 | | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 60 | 42 | 57 | 51 | 52 | 55 | | | | |
| MUL | 52 | 43 | | 70 | 46 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | 61 | 30 | 79 | 51 | 29 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 55 | 40 | 63 | 55 | 59 | 47 | | | | |
| 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 | 19 | 35 | 33 | 54 | 47 | 40 | | | | | |
| ELL | 54 | 41 | 50 | 54 | 41 | 36 | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | | | 93 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | 48 | 40 | 76 | 64 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 50 | 63 | 66 | 45 | 39 | 60 | | | | |
| MUL | 74 | 55 | | 74 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 61 | 47 | 74 | 45 | 13 | 49 | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 50 | 43 | 64 | 46 | 30 | 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 | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 43 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 383 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 90% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| 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 | 45 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 81 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 40 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 44 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 86 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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?

Based on the data, additional support is needed for Students with Disabilities, ELL, Bottom Quartile, and Tier 3 students in all subject areas.

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

Based on data, vocabulary and comprehension have the greatest need for improvement for ELA and number sense has the greatest need for improvement in math.

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

Lack of background knowledge in ELA and math contributes to the students' deficits. Teachers will use acceleration to help close the achievement gap and improve the deficiencies of students.

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

Based off of iReady data there was growth in all grade levels from fall to spring in both ELA and mathemetaics.

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

Teachers continued to focus on core instruction while accelerating through use of small group. Teachers provided small group instruction based on the areas their students showed a deficit through skill grouping and monitored their progress regularly.

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

Teachers will implement more accountable talk/discussion throughout core, student led discussion in small groups, and will use data to further drive instruction among grade levels to further drive instruction.

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.

Teachers were provided an overview on accountable talk and provided posters for their classrooms. A data team will further assist in deep dive data chats. During professional study day, acceleration training was provided to all content area teachers.

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

The district is supporting our teachers by providing DRTs support and ongoing content area PDs for teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on student data, teachers will continue to teach students how to use accountable talk with their classmates and use student led conversations in small group.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2021 - 2022 school year, the percent of students in grades 3-5 making gains in the bottom quartile on the FSA ELA will increase from 33% to 50%. Our SWD students' will include an increase on the iReady spring diagnostic from 63% on or above grade level to 70% on or above grade level.

Monitoring:

The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs in the classrooms looking for accountable talk and student led discussion. Feedback on the walkthroughs will be shared with the teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

iReady lessons will utilize accountable talk and student led discussions and improvement will be evident on diagnostics.

Rationale for

Evidence-based Strategy:

iReady will be used because it creates individualized learning paths for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teacher training for Accountable Talk and Student Led Discussion
2. Provide time for common planning to focus on standards and questioning
3. Provide ELP for reading
4. Provide differentiated instruction for students in reading and mathematics
5. Offer modified curriculum to meet the needs of SWD students

Person Responsible

Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lack of student growth based on FSA and iReady scores identified a critical need for a focus on data analysis by teachers.

Measurable Outcome: Based on data from FSA, student learning gains will increase from 53% to 70% in ELA and bottom quartile will increase from 33% to 60% in ELA.

Monitoring: Teams will turn in PLC notes reflecting their analysis of student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through Professional Learning Communities, teachers will review data from iReady and math monthly assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will analyze their data in PLCs with a data team member and be able to discuss students' strengths and weaknesses to improve core instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hold PLC/collaboration meetings bi-monthly with a PLC log to discuss/record Rtl data. Share with PSLT to analyze data and trends, identify barriers, discuss best practices in providing interventions and progress monitoring of student growth.
2. Use iReady data to assist in identifying students with needs
3. Provide vertical PLC opportunities throughout the year

Person Responsible Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Behavior in primary classrooms will be monitored. Teachers will implement the schoolwide behavior plan with positive supports. MTSS team will monitor student behavior data.

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.

Teachers assist in decision making through our Steering committee that meets monthly. Additionally, all staff are encouraged to share concerns or ideas for improvement with administration. Parents can participate in our environment through becoming a member of our school SIP team and our school PTA meeting Events are planned throughout the school year to help encourage a positive school climate with parents, teachers and students. Students follow a code of conduct while staff encourage a positive culture through classroom/school behavior plan.

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

Teachers encourage and create a positive culture in the classroom. The administration team encourages a school wide positive culture in the school.

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: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |