

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lockhart Elementary Magnet 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

Lockhart Elementary Magnet School

3719 N 17TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Corey Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Lockhart Elementary Magnet School

3719 N 17TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

Provide Rigorous Instruction for Disciplined Excellence

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare students to be critical thinkers, problem solvers, and responsible members of society

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
Corsanico, Natalie	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school responsible for overseeing the school improvement action. Additionally, the principal is responsible for the building and all of the people in it.
Edwards, Yvette	Assistant Principal	The AP assists the principal as the instructional leader of the campus and also oversees the functions, programs, and people in the building.
Witt, Stacey	Reading Coach	Oversees the planning and implementation of core instruction of Reading. Ms. Flowers coaches teachers to build teacher capacity and provide support. Ms. Flowers also facilitates Data Chats and creates strategic plans in Reading, as well as provide PD to the staff.
Mann, Annika	Math Coach	Oversees the planning and implementation of core instruction in mathematics. Ms. Mann coaches teachers to build teacher capacity and provide support. Ms. Mann also facilitates Data Chats and creates strategic plans in mathematics, as well as provide PD to the staff.
Merrill, Kara	Other	Oversees and supports the school improvement plan and focuses her efforts on facilitating planning and implementation of science core instruction.
McGregor, Megan	Other	Oversees the MTSS process for both academics and behavior intervention.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Corey Jackson

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

3

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

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

377

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

6

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

7

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	53	53	61	58	59	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	341
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	16	15	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	2	7	9	16	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	4	10	15	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	15	27	23	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	35	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 11/18/2021

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	33	57	57	49	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300
Attendance below 90 percent	9	9	13	13	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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	33	57	57	49	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300
Attendance below 90 percent	9	9	13	13	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	7	25	41	30	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
Course failure in Math	11	21	44	36	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	2	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	1	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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				29%	52%	57%	41%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				33%	55%	58%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	50%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				30%	54%	63%	42%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				40%	57%	62%	46%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	46%	51%	48%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				28%	50%	53%	31%	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	23%	52%	-29%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	24%	55%	-31%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	33%	57%	-24%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	60%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	26%	51%	-25%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The Proficiency Data listed below comes from the following sources:

Reading - iReady (proficiency is reflective of OL students)

Math - iReady (proficiency is reflective of OL students)

Science - HCPS Beginning of the Year Assessment

other metrics are pulled from IPT and EdConnect

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19%	39%	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	38%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	38%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18%	21%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	22%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	0%	57% ⁰
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	75%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	3%	11%	24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	11%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	7%	8%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12%	9%	18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	7%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	27%	20%	14%
	English Language Learners	20%	0%	0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13%	26%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	26%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	16%	28%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6%	11%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	11%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	4%	20%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8%	22%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	22%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	22%	41%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7%	11%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	10%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	22%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	33%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15%	15%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	12%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	21%	21%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11%	19%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	16%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	7%	14%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	24%	29%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	25%	24%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	12%	12%
	English Language Learners	38%	23%	24%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	25		14	17		10				
ELL	45			18							
BLK	25	46	58	27	34	18	17				
HSP	82			45							
FRL	29	50	54	30	42	17	26				
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	12	37	50	12	28	36	11				
ELL	47			41							
BLK	23	30	44	26	39	43	27				
HSP	42	41		46	53		45				
FRL	26	31	47	27	37	38	25				

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	17	34	40	23	49	47	17				
ELL	73			73							
BLK	35	50	52	35	43	46	17				
HSP	70	69		74	50						
FRL	38	52	52	40	45	50	26				

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
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	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trends for ELA show our proficiency is low across all subjects. Only 1/3 of our students are meeting proficiency across math and reading. While all subgroups are below 41% target, our students with disabilities are our most vulnerable population, underperforming in compared to their peers.

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

Based on the data, we have focused our work at Lockhart by improving overall core instruction. The areas that need the most attention are our Math BQ gains, and gains for our students with disabilities in both Reading and Math. When analyzing the trends in our progress monitoring data, Foundational skills such as phonics are hindering our students success in grades K-3. In grades, 4 & 5, the area of vocabulary and comprehension are the greatest needs. For math, we need to continue to build capacity in number sense and the area of multiplication and division across 3-5.

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

Gaps in learning due to the Covid pandemic are contributing factors to the need for improvement.

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

We have not taken our second round of iReady tests yet, but other assessments are showing growth in the areas of concern being addressed in planning: phonics through SIPP's instruction, vocabulary skills and strategies, the use of text features, and author's purpose. In math, our math monthlies so an increase in proficiency and gains as students begin to master multiplication and division, subtraction with regrouping, and fractions.

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

We are engaging in teacher data dives, student data chats, and goal setting for classes and students. Based on chats we are spiraling mini-reteaches and practice activities to ensure over time student master standards. In reading, we are addressing the core standards about main idea or central idea, structure, vocabulary, key ideas and details daily in addition to the focus standards of the week.

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

To accelerate learning we do Unit Internalizations in both reading and math. These content PLCs drive the instruction of the units we cover. During these PLCs we use our data analyzed from progress monitoring assessments to prepare lessons to accelerate learning and support gaps in learning prior to the lesson launch.

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 are engaging in vertical PLCs monthly and standards-based collaborative planning with coaching weekly. Additionally, specific PD has been provided across math and reading (Vocab, Phonics,

foundational skills, Wonders PD). All PD is followed up with in planning and walkthroughs with feedback.

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

We are constantly building culture and the capacity of our school staff to lessen teacher turnover, keep our teachers learning, growing and supporting one another.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Student achievement will increase through improving overall core instruction focused on standards aligned tasks through small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

At least 50% of students will be proficient in reading as evidenced by scoring in the on-level or above-level ranges on the Spring iReady Diagnostic assessment.

At least 50% of students will be proficient in math as evidenced by scoring in the on-level or above-level ranges on the Spring iReady Diagnostic assessment.

At least 50% of students will score at or above 70% on quarterly Science common assessments.

Monitoring:

By December 2021 75% of teachers will be observed teaching standards aligned tasks in small groups. By Spring 2021 100% of teachers will be observed teaching standards aligned tasks in small groups.

1. Based strategic learning walks by core subjects, we want to see 90% of teachers putting students in appropriate small groups with standards aligned tasks by the end of the 1st nine weeks.

2. Assessment data will be monitored with instructional action plans created. i-Ready Diagnostic quarterly, Curriculum Aligned assessments in all core classes (Reading, Math, Science) monthly, and teacher-created common assessments when needed in core subject areas.

2. Administrators will attend common planning to ensure fidelity & provide feedback and coaching for standards aligned small group instruction. Admin will provide 5-10 minutes feedback session for coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Weekly Common Planning and follow-up sessions

2. PD on 4 Principles of Excellent Instruction (from TNTP) tailored to small group instruction.

2. Ongoing coaching and feedback for teachers and coaches on standards-aligned small group instruction.

3. Ongoing professional development for teachers and staff based on classroom visits and progress monitoring data based on trend-data and next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Weekly common planning sessions will allow the teachers to work directly with the content coaches to plan standards-aligned lessons using small group instruction utilizing strategies to accelerate learning. This time will also allow for analysis of student needs and a deeper understanding of best practices in instruction.

2. Ongoing coaching and feedback will be provided by administrators and coaches through daily classroom visits, instructional learning walks, and coaching cycles focused on standards-aligned lessons using small group instruction.

3. Job-embedded professional development will be facilitated by Academic Coaches, RTI Resource and Lead Teacher, will occur in a variety of methods including lesson studies,

coaching cycles, learning walks, modeled lessons, co-planning, monthly PLC's, curriculum training, and trainings for standards-aligned lessons using small group instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Admin will create a master schedule that allows for common planning 50 minutes daily. Coaches will have planning weekly to ensure standards-aligned lessons and small group instruction.
2. Principal will provide PD on the 4 Principals of Excellent Instruction & student learning look-fors. Planning protocols created to support look-fors around standards-based small group instruction.
3. Common planning will be monitored by administrators to ensure fidelity and provide feedback and coaching for coaches and teachers. Admin will provide 5-10 minutes feedback for coaches.
4. Implementation of planning focused on student learning look-fors will be monitored by observation/feedback
5. Look-for Trends will be collected on standards-based, small group instruction, individual feedback provided, exemplars (classroom instruction) identified, coaching cycle begins with peer observation, side-by-side coaching, and safe practice feedback. Walkthroughs to ensure effective implementation will occur. Look-fors will be adjusted for a new ILT cycle.

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

Steps for Evidenced-based Strategy:

Strategy 2 - Ongoing coaching and feedback

1. Develop specific look-fors/observables with the leadership team and faculty focused on standards-aligned tasks through the use of small group instruction.
2. Provide weekly feedback to teachers regarding the implementation of instructional practices identified in the look-fors.
3. The Instructional Leadership Team will analyze teacher data to identify trends in order to plan professional development opportunities to further engage students in standards-based, small group instruction using acceleration strategies.

Monitoring: Admin to conduct learning walks to observe school wide look fors and provide individual feedback

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

Steps for Evidenced-based Strategy:

Strategy 3 - Job-embedded PD

1. Create a monthly professional development calendar to outline needed PD and a timeline based on baseline data on standards-based, small group instruction to implement with the leadership team which consists of at least Principal, AP, Content Area Resource, RTI and Lead Teacher.
2. Revisit quarterly to evaluate the effectiveness of PD methods and outcomes.
3. Meet with Instructional Leadership Team monthly to review data to drive professional development initiatives to further support standards-based, small group instruction.

Monitoring: Admin will meet weekly with Leadership Team to review data.

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Achievement of students with disabilities, Black students and Economically Disadvantaged students will improve through consistent, on-going analysis of data to drive instruction.

Measurable Outcome: The learning gains in ELA of students with disabilities will increase from 12%-2019 to 41% as evidenced by the 2021 FSA.

The learning gains in ELA of Black students will increase from 23% -2019 to 41% as evidenced by the 2021 FSA.

The learning gains in ELA of Economically Disadvantaged students will increase from 26%-2019 to 41% as evidenced by the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring:

1. PLCs will be held with the MTSS team, Grade Level teams, Instructional Leadership Team to analyze data and plan for instruction and intervention for ESSA students performing below-level. (Admin will attend to ensure fidelity)
2. MTSS team will have a data collection spreadsheet and calendar to ensure efficiency of the process highlighting our BQ and ESSA students performing below-level. This will be reviewed in MTSS Meetings and Academic Reviews. (Admin will work with the School Psych and RTI Resource to do this and follow up with teachers)
3. The Leadership Team will meet regularly to inform PD for ESSA subgroups and differentiation support. (Admin will work with content coaches, Lead Teacher, RTI A Resource Teacher, ESE Specialist, and ELL Specialist to provide support and PD)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Gilda Garcia (gilda.garcia@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Consistent analysis of progress monitoring data to inform instruction specifically for ESSA students performing below-level and BQ students.
2. Create a comprehensive MTSS system that prioritizes students needs and ESSA students performing below-level.
3. Regular data briefings with faculty and leadership team for goal-setting purposes for ESSA students performing below-level and BQ students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. A consistent, ongoing system for progress monitoring and regular analysis of data will be used to ensure that instruction is targeted to students' needs, specifically for ESSA students performing below-level. This will include monthly Math and ELA formative assessments, as well as regularly planned data analysis sessions following assessments.
2. A comprehensive MTSS system will allow for early identification of students, specifically ESSA students performing below-level in need of specific intervention, as well as the time for the intervention to occur.
3. Faculty must be well-informed of the progress of students on a regular basis in order to maintain focus on the goals of the ESSA students performing below-level.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategy 1 - Progress monitoring and Data Analysis

1. The AP will create a calendar of assessments to inform instruction and to progress monitor understanding of standards taught.
2. After each assessment, administrators, coaches, RTI Resource, Lead Teacher and teachers will meet to analyze the data and plan for upcoming instruction focusing on ESSA students performing below-level.
3. The coaches will create Student Data and Goal Setting sheets for students to capture their data and set goals based allotting more time and support for ESSA students performing below-level.

4. Student Data Chats will be held to encourage all students, specifically ESSA students performing below-level to know and understand where they are at with their learning, what they need to progress, and provide opportunities for goal setting and celebrations.
5. Admin will support data chats with push-in support and walkthrough with feedback.

Monitoring: Admin will attend all PLC Data sessions

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

Strategy 2 - Comprehensive MTSS System

1. Administration will ensure MTSS process by creating a regular MTSS meeting schedule, identifying time in the schedule for interventions focused on ESSA students performing below-level.
2. Support will also be provided during one faculty a month to help teachers with completing the paperwork - this will be based on walk-in support or referred by administration.
2. Hire a RTI Resource teacher to oversee the implementation of the MTSS process to ensure that students schoolwide and specifically in all subgroups receive the interventions that they need.
3. Administrators will provide ongoing feedback to teachers on the implementation of interventions, push in support will be provided as needed specifically for ESSA students performing below-level.

Monitoring: Admin will oversee MTSS process by attending all meetings, reviewing paperwork, and giving feedback. Admin will observe and monitor effectiveness of RTI Resource by regular observation and feedback.

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

Strategy 3 - Data Analysis and Planning for Instruction

1. Administration will meet with the leadership team to review data to plan instructional priorities and modify walkthrough/feedback forms.
3. Data Analysis Sessions will held to provide feedback to teachers and coaches.
3. Push-in support will be provided for underachieving students in ESSA subgroups & BQ.
4. Administration will meet with the leadership team regularly to plan job embedded PD and support for teachers focused on ESSA students performing below-level.
5. Relevant data and professional development will be shared at each faculty meeting.
6. Academic Reviews will focus on ESSA subgroups students that are underachieving and providing supports to ensure these students are receiving interventions for both academics and for social-emotional health: such as mentors, tutoring, etc.)

Monitoring: Admin will meet attend data analysis PLCs and will meet weekly with leadership team .

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Student achievement in reading is currently below 50% proficiency. According to the CNA, the root cause of this is teachers not fully understanding the depth of the ELA standards and how they relate to the building of content knowledge, fluency, and comprehension. Through the implementation of ELA Common Planning Sessions focused on Unit Internalization (Backwards planning to understand scope and sequence of the content standards), lesson planning to support strong content standard and task alignment, reading coaching cycles, and data chats to support teachers with instruction, student achievement will increase.

Measurable Outcome:

Students measurable outcomes will be addressed in Data Chats and will inform instruction and include: student achievement growth in iReady, Progress Monitoring Assessments, and student achievement on Statewide Assessments.

Teacher measurable outcomes will be address through walkthrough trends, observations and feedback, and coaching cycles. Trend data will inform ELA support and PD.

Monitoring:

ELA Students achievement will be monitored through teacher and student data chats, academic review, and planning PLCs. Teachers implementation of plans and adjustments in instruction will be monitored by attendance as PLCs and observation and feedback,. as well as schoolwide ELA instructional trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will engage in ELA PLCs with content area coaches. Through collaborative planning, data chats, and PLCs teachers have better informed instruction and improve the overall reading performance at Lockhart.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

ELA instruction will be enhance with an extra focus on how our teacher build content knowledge through their reading instruction align to the standards using reading and comprehension strategies to support student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA Planning PLCs are strategically scheduled to inform instruction.

Person Responsible

Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

The reading coach will lead the Unit Internalization PLCs prior to grade levels rolling out new Units. The purpose of this it to ensure teacher teams are backwards planning to ensure the scope and sequence of lessons supports the building of content knowledge and standards, and students are supported with evidence based reading and comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible

Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

Weekly ELA planning will include ELA planning protocols for teachers to use before, during, and after planning to ensure teachers have a structure to how they are thinking out their lessons with the support of the Reading Coach.

Person Responsible

Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

ELA Progress Monitoring Data Chats will occur as ELA PMA Assessments roll out. these meetings will be structured using Before, During, and After Protocols to ensure data is informing ELA whole group instruction. small group instruction and individualize instruction.

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

The reading coach will engage in coaching cycles to provide teachers support with improving their ELA pedagogy.

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

Admin complete walkthrough with specific feedback to teacher, addition this team collects ELA trend data to inform Professional Development and job embedded PD.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website, Lockhart is ranked 1,298 out of 1,395 in the state and ranked 99 out of 119 elementary schools in the HCPS. There are 3.41 Incidents reported per 100 students.

At Lockhart Elementary we will:

- 1. Create a schoolwide Culture Plan based on PBIS & CHAMPS.**
- 2. The Lead Teacher will facilitate the implementation of Restorative Practices schoolwide to ensure students are equipped with calm down strategies, as well as to ensure a positive classroom environment.**
- 3. Guidance Counselor will provide classroom instruction on Restorative Practices throughout the school year to ensure Tier 1 Culture Plan**
- 4. Create a Comprehensive MTSS Team facilitated by the RTI Resource to ensure tiered support is provided to students whose needs are not being met by the Tier 1 Behavior Plan**
- 5. Meet regularly with our ESE Teachers to ensure Tier 3 FBA plans are being implemented and adjusted as needed. (Tier 3 plans will be based on point systems)**

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 Lockhart we will:

1. Create our common Core Values as a staff.
2. Update the Vision and Mission of the school.
3. Use the following research-based programs to ensure a positive school culture exists on campus: PBIS, CHAMPS, and Restorative Practices.
4. Utilize the SAC Team ensure equity and the voice all stakeholders voices in the decision making process..

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

1. Core Values - Administrators will lead and ensure all decisions are in line with our Core Values.
2. Vision and Mission will be developed by the staff and the SAC team.
3. PBIS, CHAMPS, and Restorative Practices will be supported by the Students Services Team and implemented by the teachers.
4. SAC Team as Equity Team - SAC Chairperson, Admin, and SAC Team Members

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$153,220.71
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG	1.0	\$58,810.47
			<i>Notes: *Reading CoachCoaches will have planning weekly to ensure standards-aligned lessons and small group instruction. Look-fors Trends will be collected on standards-based, small group instruction, individual feedback provided, exemplars (classroom instruction) identified, coaching cycle begins with peer observation, side-by-side coaching, and safe practice feedback.</i>			

	6400	210-Retirement	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$6,356.76
			<i>Notes: *Reading Coach Retirement (10.82%)</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$3,642.51
			<i>Notes: *Reading Coach FICA (6.2%)</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$851.88
			<i>Notes: *Reading Coach Medicare (1.45%)</i>			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$10,972.53
			<i>Notes: *Reading Coach Health and Life Insurance (19%)</i>			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$299.63
			<i>Notes: *Reading Coach Workers Comp (.51%)</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG	1.0	\$52,704.64
			<i>Notes: RTI Resource Teacher to oversee the implementation of the MTSS process to ensure that students schoolwide and specifically in all subgroups receive the interventions that they need. The Resource Teacher will meet to analyze the data and plan for upcoming instruction focusing on ESSA students performing below-level. The teacher will create Student Data and Goal Setting sheets for students to capture their data and set goals-based allotting more time and support for ESSA students performing below-level.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$5,578.81
			<i>Notes: RTI Resource Teacher Retirement (10.82%)</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$3,196.67
			<i>Notes: RTI Resource Teacher FICA (6.2%)</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$747.61
			<i>Notes: RTI Resource Teacher Medicare (1.45%)</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$9,796.25
			<i>Notes: RTI Resource Teacher Health and Life Insurance (19%)</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0962 - Lockhart Elementary Magnet School	UniSIG		\$262.95
			<i>Notes: RTI Resource Teacher Workers Comp (.51%)</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$161,096.25