

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Claywell Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Claywell Elementary School

4500 NORTHDALÉ BLVD, Tampa, FL 33624

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Robert Jones**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Claywell Elementary School

4500 NORTHDALD BLVD, Tampa, FL 33624

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">55%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">65%</p>

## School Grades History

	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Year</b>				
<b>Grade</b>		C	C	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.**

Claywell Elementary will provide a collaborative, nurturing environment that empowers all individuals to be productive and responsible citizens.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Claywell Elementary students will become respectful citizens and lifelong learners.

### 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
Jones, Robert	Principal	<p>The Leadership Team meets regularly. The purpose of this core is to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the MTSS process at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.</li> <li>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at all levels.</li> <li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of goals in curriculum, behavioral, and attendance domains.</li> <li>4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams</li> </ol> <p>The principal is the instructional leader of the school and maintains the facility.</p>
Wilson, Novenda	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal is an instructional leader emphasizing curriculum. She is the school's testing coordinator and program developer. She assists the principal in maintaining the school's high expectations for all.</p>
Stockslager, Lauren	School Counselor	<p>The Guidance Counselor is a support. She addresses CST, MTSS and 504 plans. She holds guidance lessons, small group and individual counseling along with peer mediation/conflict resolution. She oversees the Mentoring program.</p>
Berberich, Mariah	Attendance/Social Work	<p>The social worker monitors attendance. She coordinates the school-wide house program. She assists the guidance counselor and psychologist as a support.</p>
Acevedo, Sydney	Psychologist	<p>Screening and Testing students. Assists with CST/MRSS. Supports guidance and social worker.</p>

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Robert Jones

**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.*

1

**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.*

9

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

43



**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

641

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

1

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

6

**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	79	119	100	98	108	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	15	17	19	15	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	14	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	6	4	5	8	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	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	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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**

Friday 10/1/2021

**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	118	103	102	114	117	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	14	26	8	18	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	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	

**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	5	6	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	118	103	102	114	117	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	14	26	8	18	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	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	

**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	5	6	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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				64%	52%	57%	65%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	55%	58%	56%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	53%	46%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	54%	63%	70%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	57%	62%	59%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	46%	51%	29%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	50%	53%	65%	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	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

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

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

Iready Reading and Math Diagnostics for grades 1-5. Science baseline and midyear assessment. Spring is the FSA percentile score.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	64	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	64	76
	Students With Disabilities	25	42	67
	English Language Learners	35	30	86
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	52	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	47	71
	Students With Disabilities	23	39	69
	English Language Learners	24	22	71

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	71	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	64	74
	Students With Disabilities	39	65	71
	English Language Learners	19	48	65
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24	51	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	43	61
	Students With Disabilities	22	57	65
	English Language Learners	17	40	72

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65	75	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	70	76
	Students With Disabilities	50	57	60
	English Language Learners	36	54	65
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27	42	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	35	52
	Students With Disabilities	29	36	45
	English Language Learners	15	23	45

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	65	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	61	67
	Students With Disabilities	56	57	62
	English Language Learners	35	38	48
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33	36	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	30	48
	Students With Disabilities	30	35	48
	English Language Learners	24	15	32

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64	69	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	63	67
	Students With Disabilities	58	61	62
	English Language Learners	41	48	49
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38	41	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	33	48
	Students With Disabilities	36	44	50
	English Language Learners	20	18	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	49	58	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	55	39
	Students With Disabilities	48	56	20
	English Language Learners	34	48	29

**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	28	23	13	25	43	47	20				
ELL	47	43		47	48		45				
ASN	60			50							
BLK	50	36		25	15		23				
HSP	55	46	31	47	46	43	44				
MUL	56			56							
WHT	68	53		65	50		69				
FRL	51	44	26	41	39	35	39				
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	37	47	50	34	47	31	26				
ELL	44	48	27	47	46	36					
BLK	52	46		46	31						
HSP	57	62	50	56	48	31	36				
MUL	92			69							
WHT	73	54	50	75	62	50	71				
FRL	55	54	51	57	49	40	48				
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	27	35	37	31	29	24	26				
ELL	48	35	36	60	26	18					
BLK	46	33		50	61						
HSP	60	51	42	63	44	21	61				
MUL	85			69							
WHT	74	66	56	81	76		74				
FRL	59	53	47	64	51	26	63				

**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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	55
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO



Multiracial Students	
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	61
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	44
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?**

FSA proficiency scores in ELA and Math continue to decrease within the past two testing periods. Math is lower than ELA. Science has remained consistent. Our FSA level 1's are increasing in both ELA and Math. Grade 4 students are scoring lower than those in grades 3 and 5. Third graders are scoring proficiently better than the 4th and 5th grade. Our bottom quartile is low performing, under 50%, the past four years.

Last year's iready scores show the ESE and ELL subgroups are low performing. ELL's are the lowest subgroup in ELA and Math. Proficient scores are lower in math than reading across grade levels. Science scores increased from the baseline to midyear with ELL again being the lowest subgroup. Science showed a similar correlation to iready ELA scores.

Pre-assessment data from the current year which is listed as the percentage correct has math being our strongest area, followed by science and then reading. The fifth grade scores correspond with last year's fourth graders as showing lower scores than the other grade levels.

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

Students continue to struggle with math. While ELA is not at a level we are pleased with, it has been higher than math. However, ELA proficiency scores are not acceptable. Even though the math pre-assessment scores for this year were higher, it must be taken into account that this test only had 10-14 test items depending on the grade level which required much less stamina than a FSA test..

The bottom quartile is the lowest component for both ELA and Math. Our ESE and ELL subgroups continue to struggle.

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

Last year was a difficult year for education. Elearning became a new option. We had several teachers that had to change grade levels and teaching on site students and/or through zoom. Some teachers had three changes during the year. However, we can not use this as an excuse. Other schools were able to be successful with the same challenges. We focused on small group instruction more within the block. This small group instruction was based more on remediation than grade level instruction. The small group focus needs to change to promote on grade level instruction and increase stamina. We need to keep in mind our ESE and ELL population.

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

According to ESSA Federal Index there were no subgroups below 41%. In addition, in looking ahead to the 2021 FSA results, science proficiency remained the same and the math bottom quartile increased from 34-38%.

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

There was a focus on math content. Math monthlies, rti and ELP during the day were utilized along with additional small groups. Professional Learning Communities discussed assessments and used the data to address instructional groupings. Data included virtual grade level data walls and a physical data wall containing a card for each student. Successes were celebrated and best practice teaching strategies were discussed by grade levels for students that missed the mark.

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

PLC's need to continue to monitor student progress. Grade level collaborative planning will aid in switching teacher mindset from remediation to acceleration. Building content gaps through "on time learning" prior to grade level instruction will provide background and scaffold learning for students. This strategy will need to be planned for before new content is introduced. Staff professional development needs to be ongoing.

**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.**

Staff professional development began in August during the district's Professional Study Day. Teachers learned the definition of accelerated learning and strategies for its usage in the different content areas. Teachers were divided into content groups and later shared the Reading, Math, Science and Social Studies strategies with each other. We will use our TTD as a model classroom to showcase this strategy and identify other grade level classrooms. Learning walks will be provided. Additional staff development will be offered by our TTD teachers. Our ESE teachers and ELL teacher/para will support acceleration for their students and assist the classroom teachers in its implementation.

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

First systems in place need to be continued regarding PLC's, progress monitoring, collaborative planning, acceleration, support by ESE and ELL staff to the classroom teachers, and administrative

feedback. Next, student mental health is an area that needs to be taught so students feel positive, motivated, and able to demonstrate grit. Students must be persistent during challenging content and build stamina to complete longer tasks. Last, instructional methods need to be tweaked. Classroom instruction requires more student discussion and less teacher lecture to lead to greater student engagement. Students learn best if they are engaged.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Data discussions and progress monitoring during grade level PLC's have been ongoing the past few years. Procedures and the agenda continues to be frequently updated. Last year there was a focus on small remediation groups. However, our scores continued to decline. Our bottom quartiles remain low. ELA and Math BQ are and have been our lowest percentiles of data calculations. Our proficiency percentages are not much higher either. This has us refocused on the core instruction. There was evidence during classroom walkthroughs that students did not remain fully engaged throughout the lesson. The teacher was the primary speaker. Questioning was a mixture of single teacher questions followed by single student answers, partner turn and talks, and class discussions. However, class discussions made up only a small percentage of content lessons. It was observed that during student discussions the students remained fully engaged. They were able to restate other's thoughts and add to them or even disagree. Students could also state their learning to the observer. We believe strengthening the core will lead to student academic success. This means changing our instructional practice. Utilizing a specific strategy will lead to greater student engagement. This strategy is student discussion.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Maintain high level academic instruction with student engagement through student discussion as measured by increasing FSA ELA and Math bottom quartile score percentages to 100%. The outcome is increased ELA and Math bottom quartiles. Increase ELA from 25% to 100% and Math from 38% to 100% as measured by FSA.

**Monitoring:**

As FSA is the end of the year state test this focus area will be monitored throughout the year by other assessments: Beginning and midyear ELA reading and ELA writing, Math monthlies, and iredy diagnostic tests for Fall, Winter, and Spring. These assessments will be discussed during PLC's. Collaborative planning will include student discussion content plans.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Student discussion increases student engagement as part of instructional academic practice. Student discussion means students orally elaborate their thoughts, justify their thinking, and ask one another about their thinking. The teacher poses questions and the groups discuss their thinking and justify their reasoning. Students use precise language related to content area.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

John Hattie's Visible Learning influences related to learning outcomes points to classroom discussion as .82 where .40 is considered the hinge point. Students speak more and there are more open questions. Student engagement is .56 on the scale. Combining the two leads to an even higher effect size.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Planning - Grade levels hold weekly collaborative planning sessions to plan for student discussion. Identify weekly day/time of grade level meetings.

**Person Responsible**

Novenda Wilson (novenda.wilson@hcps.net)

Monitor Progress - Weekly grade level PLC's using agendas and Team Leader Report.  
 Maintain grade level data wall.  
 Leadership Team reviews data.  
 ILT monitors data.

**Person Responsible** Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

Leadership - Classroom walkthroughs and observations to track student discussions. Ask students what they are learning.  
Feedback of instructional practices.  
Attend grade level planning/PLC meetings.

**Person Responsible** Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

ESE/ELL Support- ESE Specialist and ELL Resource Teacher - Increase VE teachers and ELL Teacher/Para support by more fusing into classrooms rather than student pull outs.  
Provide resources to classroom teachers.

**Person Responsible** Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

Support Staff - Guidance, Social Worker, and Psychologist - Focus on removing educational barriers to improve student success.  
Poor attendance - Social Worker  
MTSS - Academic and Behavioral Interventions- Psychologist  
Mental Health - Individual and Small group counseling - Guidance Counselor

**Person Responsible** Sydney Acevedo (sydney.acevedo@hcps.net)

**#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Monitoring:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data discussions and progress monitoring within PLC's have been ongoing the past few years. Last year small groups were an instructional focus of remediation. During classroom walkthroughs it was noted that the teacher was the primary speaker. Many times questioning consisted of a teacher question followed by a single student answer and partner turn and talks. Some classrooms expanded into discussions. However, only a small part of the instructional lesson centered on student discussion. Ongoing engagement did not always occur. Student engagement was evident, but not sustained

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Monitoring:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

#### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 48% in grade 4 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to teacher grade level and student group changes during covid protocols. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include teacher and student clarity of the alignment in instruction, learning targets, daily tasks, and unit performance tasks resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on grade 4 ELA FSA scores.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of 4th grade students scoring at a Level 3 or higher on Spring 22 ELA FSA assessment will increase to 80% as measured by the Spring 22 ELA FSA assessment.

**Monitoring:** The strategy effectiveness will be measured through grade 4 Spring 22 ELA FSA. It will also be monitored throughout the year by the district Midyear ELA Assessment, teacher observations, exit tickets, and data collection. Data collected will be entered on the school's grade level data walls. Administrative walkthroughs will include checking for this strategy.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Increase teacher and student clarity around the alignment of instruction, learning targets, daily tasks, and end of unit performance tasks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** In 2021, the data showed 4th grade students scored 48% proficiency on the ELA FSA. The improvement strategy of increasing teacher and student clarity around the alignment of instruction, learning target, daily tasks, and end of unit performance tasks will improve student proficiency resulting in improved student academic performance in ELA.

#### Action Steps to Implement

Learning targets and daily tasks are aligned to the posted essential and guiding questions from their unit listing the daily performance task that allows students to make their thinking visible.

**Person Responsible** Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

Teachers model the alignment of the learning targets, daily tasks, and the posted performance tasks.

**Person Responsible** Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

Students articulate the alignment of their daily task to the learning target and posted performance task.

**Person Responsible** Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

Utilize our TTD classroom and teacher leaders as model classrooms to show teachers what the connection between the target, task, and guiding question looks like.

**Person Responsible** Robert Jones (robert.jones@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.

**School incident ranking is in the low category as compared to the state data. There were 0.3 incidents per 100 students. An area of concern that will be monitored is threat/intimidation incidents. Monitor to have fewer incidents this school year.**

#### **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.**

Claywell is a full inclusion school. We have high expectations of instruction and care for our kids. We have various organizations on campus to reach out to parents. We have SAC and PTA that are functioning on our campus. We also have business partners with the community. We are a neighborhood school that is supported by our neighborhood. We explain the curriculum and ESE and ELL supports that students will receive at Claywell to parents. We communicate through our website, school newsletters, and parent links as well as during teacher/parent conferences and Family Nights. Our Family Nights are academically based highlighting content activities for students and parents.

We are focused on increasing emotional regulation among students as evidenced from our Insight Survey.

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

Teachers will hold class meetings to promote positive mental health. Guidance will visit grade level classes for group guidance lessons. School-wide growth mindset expectations are followed. Teachers are using growth mindset vocabulary. Weekly PSLT meetings provide support to struggling students. Bi-monthly ILT meetings addresses the schools focus and strategies for improvement.

PTA assists with our positive expectations. They provide additional resources and learning opportunities for our students. We have also collaborated to have interns on our campus. This has helped us obtain excellent teachers.

#### **Part V: Budget**



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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>