

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Lopez 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>20</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>25</b> |

# 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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (46%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)<br>2016-17: C (53%)  |
| <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, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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>20</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>25</b> |

## Lopez Elementary School

200 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 81%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(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           | <p>To oversee all portions of the SIP.<br/>The Leadership team meets weekly to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices</li> <li>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices (modeling, coaching cycles, learning walks)</li> <li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data</li> <li>5. Communicate ongoing schoolwide trends/data</li> </ol> |
| Gay, Kenneth       | Assistant Principal | <p>To oversee all portions of the SIP.<br/>The Leadership team meets weekly to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices</li> <li>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices (modeling, coaching cycles, learning walks)</li> <li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data</li> <li>5. Communicate ongoing schoolwide trends/data</li> </ol> |
| Piccorelli, Rachel | Instructional Coach | <p>To oversee all portions of the SIP.<br/>The Leadership team meets weekly to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices</li> <li>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices (modeling, coaching cycles, learning walks)</li> <li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data</li> <li>5. Communicate ongoing schoolwide trends/data</li> </ol> |
| Jauch, Gina        | Instructional Coach | <p>To oversee all portions of the SIP.<br/>The Leadership team meets weekly to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices</li> <li>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices (modeling, coaching cycles, learning walks)</li> <li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data</li> <li>5. Communicate ongoing schoolwide trends/data</li> </ol> |

### 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 |       |
| 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/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 23   | 42     | 53     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 24   | 43     | 59     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 11   | 21     | 43     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 16   | 29     | 33     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 26   | 42     | 61     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 18   | 34     | 62     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 25   | 13     | 50     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 27   | 40     | 0      |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
| Grade 2                  |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 21   | 39     | 53     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 20   | 36     | 51     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 20   | 36     | 31     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 14   | 43     | 29     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 17   | 36     | 54     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 11   | 36     | 64     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 14   | 20     | 46     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 14   | 29     | 43     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |

| Grade 3                  |                               |      |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 59   | 66     | 74     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 39   | 56     | 61     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 11   | 25     | 14     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 50   | 63     | 38     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 23   | 37     | 55     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 15   | 27     | 50     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 13   | 13     | 17     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 13   | 25     | 0      |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
| Grade 4                  |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 28   | 31     | 62     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 32   | 34     | 64     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 22   | 21     | 28     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 10   | 10     | 22     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 22   | 33     | 52     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 20   | 26     | 57     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 22   | 26     | 47     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 10   | 10     | 63     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | 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. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | FSA Math proficiency will increase to 55 (+5 points)<br>FSA Math gains will increase to 50 (+6 points)<br>FSA Math BQ gains will increase to 40 (+5 points)   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development.<br>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.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | 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.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | 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. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | FSA Math proficiency will increase to 55 (+5 points)<br>FSA Math gains will increase to 50 (+6 points)<br>FSA Math BQ gains will increase to 40 (+5 points)   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development.<br>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.                    |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Teachers will participate in a Professional Development to learn discussion strategies that will involve all learners during instruction.<br>Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach to design thought provoking questions.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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](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.

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 |