Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lopez Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lopez Elementary School

200 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Zemenaye Harris

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (51%) 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

Lopez Elementary School

200 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will be a community of teaching and learning excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will provide a challenging curriculum in an atmosphere of encouragement for individuals to reach their full potential.

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
Harris, Zemenaye	Principal	To oversee all portions of the SIP. The Leadership team meets weekly to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices (modeling, coaching cycles, learning walks) 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data 5. Communicate ongoing schoolwide trends/data
Gay, Kenneth	Assistant Principal	To oversee all portions of the SIP. The Leadership team meets weekly to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices (modeling, coaching cycles, learning walks) 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data 5. Communicate ongoing schoolwide trends/data
Piccorelli, Rachel	Instructional Coach	To oversee all portions of the SIP. The Leadership team meets weekly to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices (modeling, coaching cycles, learning walks) 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data 5. Communicate ongoing schoolwide trends/data
Jauch, Gina	Instructional Coach	To oversee all portions of the SIP. The Leadership team meets weekly to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices (modeling, coaching cycles, learning walks) 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data 5. Communicate ongoing schoolwide trends/data

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Zemenaye Harris

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

543

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

3

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

4

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	88	71	83	96	70	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	18	10	16	7	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	31	40	23	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	0	3	12	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/6/2021

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	64	64	87	71	88	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	11	13	22	16	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
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	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	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	64	64	87	71	88	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	11	13	22	16	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
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	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	52%	57%	55%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	55%	58%	43%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				23%	50%	53%	32%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	54%	63%	57%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	57%	62%	65%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	46%	51%	51%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	50%	53%	54%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	53%	-15%
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 Diagnostics

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	42	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	43	59
	Students With Disabilities	11	21	43
	English Language Learners	16	29	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	42	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	34	62
	Students With Disabilities	25	13	50
	English Language Learners	27	40	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	39	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	36	51
	Students With Disabilities	20	36	31
	English Language Learners	14	43	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	36	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	36	64
	Students With Disabilities	14	20	46
	English Language Learners	14	29	43

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59	66	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	56	61
	Students With Disabilities	11	25	14
	English Language Learners	50	63	38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	37	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	27	50
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	17
	English Language Learners	13	25	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	31	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	34	64
	Students With Disabilities	22	21	28
	English Language Learners	10	10	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	33	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	26	57
	Students With Disabilities	22	26	47
	English Language Learners	10	10	63

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57	58	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	33	44
	Students With Disabilities	52	63	65
	English Language Learners	0	14	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	40	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	34	46
	Students With Disabilities	28	36	50
	English Language Learners	25	13	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	54	45	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	53	NA
	Students With Disabilities	97	53	NA
	English Language Learners	32	34	NA

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	36	53		40	47		33				
ELL	30	44		35	56		8				
BLK	50	38		41	31		33				
HSP	40	48	40	43	56		25				
MUL	69			69							
WHT	52	65		57	39		48				
FRL	47	49	47	49	44	35	35				

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	41	46	28	38	52	46	29				
ELL	30	39		44	52		10				
BLK	41	41		41	56		23				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	48	51	18	55	63	31	35				
MUL	47	46		53	77						
WHT	58	43	15	58	51	36	58				
FRL	49	47	21	50	58	48	43				

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	24	35	33	31	57	50	17				
ELL	41	35		48	63		50				
BLK	45	33	27	40	63		31				
HSP	48	42	29	59	73		38				
MUL	50	55		56	55						
WHT	65	46	40	62	63	40	69				
FRL	52	42	35	52	63	52	51				

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
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
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	69
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	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

Across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas, our Lopez staff and students have room for growth in developing academic ownership and agency for all learners. According to our schoolwide panorama data, only 52% of our learners demonstrate self-efficacy (or belief in their own capacity), while a lesser 36% of our students responded favorably to being able to do “the hardest work” that is assigned in class. Equally as significant is that only 69% of our teachers believe that students are doing the majority of the thinking. Our schoolwide classroom observations confirm this with less than 15% of our students showing academic ownership consistently across all content areas.

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

Based on our 2020 progress monitoring and state assessments, our greatest areas for growth in ELA are in cluster 1: Key Ideas and Details as well as well as the proficiency and gains among our Students with Disabilities and our English Language Learners. In Science, our students have declined across the course of the past few years, with the following components falling below 55%: Nature of Science and Earth and Space. In Mathematics our greatest area in need of improvement is our FSA proficiency levels and gains. 57% of students tested did not make gains. 28% of the bottom quartile students made gains.

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

As a result of the pandemic, our most struggling students took the hardest hit. For our students with specific learning disabilities and our students who are working to acquire a second language, the nature of eLearning and social distancing made close, in-depth collaboration around a text challenging. These students need a robust and print rich learning environment full of multidisciplinary approaches that proved to be quite challenging given our state of school. Although our instructors worked tirelessly to provide the best possible situation for our learners, nothing takes the place of responsive in-person teaching. As a result, our teachers and staff are working to identify and prioritize student needs, for the purpose of accelerating students toward the grade level standards, particularly in the area of key ideas and details and numbers and operations in mathematics. With regards to all content areas, but especially Science, we recognize the need for a balanced curriculum. We must provide a balance of content, integrating often, but also a balance in delivery models (I.e. exploration, teacher-directed, student-led dialogic discussion).

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

Based on our 2020 progress monitoring and state assessments, our greatest areas of improvement are in our 3rd grade reading proficiency, bottom quartile gains in 4th and 5th grade, and proficiency among our African American students in 4th and 5th grade. In Mathematics, grades 3-5, 75% of our ELL population made gains. In iReady mathematics Tier 1 consistently increased, while the tier 3 group decreased.

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

This improvement is a direct result of a strengthened core, and targeted small groups. As a school, we've made an effort to target our bottom quartile students with more consistent and standards-based support, as well as our tier 2 learners who need that additional push to reach proficiency. We've paired up support with specific students through ELP and small group instruction (within and outside of the classroom) for the purpose of noticing and naming specific student needs. We also initiated our focus on academic ownership for all learners. Whereas we've typically had a smaller pocket of students who believed they could do the hardest work, we've worked to develop a culture that all students, regardless of physical, intellectual, or emotional differences, can and will be successful.

In the area of mathematics, math monthlies were utilized to track standards mastery. Grade 2 was added to the math monthly assessment cycle. Grade levels conducted monthly data chats to address misconceptions and create next steps. ELL students were given mathematic vocabulary terms translated into Spanish for reference and study guides.

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

Accelerating learning in reading is based off of 3 components: topic, standard, and strategy.

At each level of student support (schoolwide, grade level, class, small group, individual), we can accelerate students by providing and developing agency with respect to reading topics. We can purposefully pair texts with learners to build necessary background knowledge, and instill in students the desire to seek out opportunities to connect ideas across texts, tasks, and content areas.

Acceleration through standards requires careful consideration of standards to be mastered, and the prerequisite pieces necessary for success. By using learning ladders, instructors can identify which areas need more scaffolded support prior to teaching the targeted grade level standard(s).

To accelerate learning through the use of strategies, instructors need to be focused and intentional in noticing literacy behaviors that are present, and implementing strategies that best support the learner in acquiring literacy behaviors not yet present so that whole reader is supported

In mathematics prerequisite assessments and data are utilized to drive instruction.

iReady prerequisite reports combined with learning ladders provide a sequence of prerequisite skills to embed into accelerated groups and instruction.

Acceleration Fast forwards items provided by the district are utilized to accelerate learning prior to a unit of study.

Math monthly data is interpreted, and next steps are made to determine when and how acceleration will take place adjacent to relevant content.

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.

In addition to our schoolwide and content specific professional development on acceleration, we have implemented two new support structures at Lopez. Teachers are provided with weekly opportunities to gather across the grade level, and with coaches and administrators to lesson plan. These sessions are focused on internalizing and applying best practices in instruction to build capacity among students. Acceleration begins with knowing where students are, where they need to go, and the steps we will take to get them there. To support the “knowing where they are”, we have also developed opportunities for data chats, MTSS grade level discussions, and professional development by extending our ‘specials’ time to 45 minutes. We believe that by developing a culture of student agency and academic ownership, we structure acceleration as not just something teacher do, but a way of learning for students. Our first professional development was focused on analyzing student evidence of academic ownership and developing the teacher moves necessary for ownership to take place. Groups collaborated to understand the subcategories of this practice (i.e. precise language, conversation structures, productive struggle) and to make plans for implementation. In our October PD, we are targeting 5 collaborative structures to support teachers with additional and actionable steps to facilitate this type of learning in their classrooms.

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

Our plan to ensure sustainability involves the continued support of our resource teachers (math, media, reading, rti) as well as our SEL team to develop a culture for learning that prioritizes student agency and academic ownership. In addition to this support staff that provide job embedded professional development, we have developed demo classrooms as a way for teachers to learn and grow by seeing each other in action. Our plan for sustainability involves growing this model as a way to prioritize growth mindset, and to build the capacity of our staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will implement a common planning protocol to include opportunities for teacher clarity around targets and tasks that are aligned to the rigor of the standard. Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 46% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher (6% SWD, 40% African Americans, and 19% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	FSA ELA proficiency will increase to 55 (+6 points) FSA ELA gains will increase to 55 (+2 points)
Monitoring:	Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our SWD, ELL, and African American students based on our instructional priorities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach aligned to BEST or Florida Standards as applicable so they can deliver on grade level instructions to students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 46% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher (6% SWD, 40% African Americans, and 19% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach
Bimonthly Professional Development based on trend data
Opportunities for teachers to participate in Coaching Cycles, Side-by-Side Coaching, Learning Walks, and Leverage Leadership based on teacher needs
Ongoing feedback provided by administration based on look-fors

Person Responsible	Kenneth Gay (kenneth.gay@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will incorporate structures and strategies that encourage student discussion, academic ownership, and active engagement. Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 46% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher (6% SWD, 40% African Americans, and 19% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be independent thinkers.
Measurable Outcome:	FSA ELA proficiency will increase to 55 (+6 points) FSA ELA gains will increase to 55 (+2 points)
Monitoring:	Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our SWD, ELL, and African American students based on our instructional priorities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in a Professional Development to learn discussion strategies that will involve all learners during instruction. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach to design thought provoking questions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 46% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher (6% SWD, 40% African Americans, and 19% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be independent thinkers.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach
Bimonthly Professional Development based on trend data
Opportunities for teachers to participate in Coaching Cycles, Side-by-Side Coaching, Learning Walks, and Leverage Leadership based on teacher needs
Ongoing feedback provided by administration based on look-fors

Person Responsible	Kenneth Gay (kenneth.gay@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will implement a common planning protocol to include opportunities for teacher clarity around targets and tasks that are aligned to the rigor of the standard. Based on the 2021 Math FSA scores, 47% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher (16% SWD, 35% African Americans, and 26% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	FSA Math proficiency will increase to 55 (+5 points) FSA Math gains will increase to 50 (+6 points) FSA Math BQ gains will increase to 40 (+5 points)
Monitoring:	Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our SWD, ELL, and African American students based on our instructional priorities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach aligned to Florida Standards so they can deliver on grade level instructions to students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the 2021 Math FSA scores, 47% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher (16% SWD, 35% African Americans, and 26% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach
Bimonthly Professional Development based on trend data
Opportunities for teachers to participate in Coaching Cycles, Side-by-Side Coaching, Learning Walks, and Leverage Leadership based on teacher needs
Ongoing feedback provided by administration based on look-fors

Person Responsible	Kenneth Gay (kenneth.gay@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will incorporate structures and strategies that encourage student discussion, academic ownership, and active engagement. Based on the 2021 Math FSA scores, 47% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher (16% SWD, 35% African Americans, and 26% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	FSA Math proficiency will increase to 55 (+5 points) FSA Math gains will increase to 50 (+6 points) FSA Math BQ gains will increase to 40 (+5 points)
Monitoring:	Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our SWD, ELL, and African American students based on our instructional priorities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in a Professional Development to learn discussion strategies that will involve all learners during instruction. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach to design thought provoking questions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the 2021 Math FSA scores, 47% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher (16% SWD, 35% African Americans, and 26% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach
Bimonthly Professional Development based on trend data
Opportunities for teachers to participate in Coaching Cycles, Side-by-Side Coaching, Learning Walks, and Leverage Leadership based on teacher needs
Ongoing feedback provided by administration based on look-fors

Person Responsible Kenneth Gay (kenneth.gay@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Restorative & Trauma-Sensitive Practices
-Relationship Building
-Structure and Predictability
-Social-Emotional Learning
-Emotion Regulation
-Restorative Language

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

Students, Caregivers, Teachers & Staff will promote a positive culture for students by.....
-building relationships with all stakeholders
-providing a structure with predictability
-embedding social-emotional learning in daily lessons
-explicitly teaching emotion regulation techniques
-using restorative language

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: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**