

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mckitrick Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mckitrick Elementary School

5503 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Allison Cline

Start Date for this Principal: 6/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	13%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mckitrick Elementary School

5503 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	12%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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 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 believe in nurturing talent, imagination, and life-long learning. We believe in teachers that engage with innovation and effectiveness. We believe in a balance between independence and collaboration. We believe in educating for the future. We believe in children.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be provided equitable experiences which build their foundation for intellectual and social growth. Our mission is to develop a positive learning community where everyone succeeds.

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
Cline, Allison	Principal	Oversee goals and implementation of strategies to insure student growth. Monitor data to support and adjust instructional goals as needed.
Manrique, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	Coordinate SAC Meetings, coordinate development of School Improvement Plan, Recruit SAC Parent membership, Coordinate SIP Vote, Waiver Vote, A+ Vote.
	Assistant Principal	Determine areas of focus based on school wide data, school wide leadership team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/21/2020, Allison Cline

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.*

5

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

996

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

1

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

1

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	130	135	172	177	216	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	998
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	10	10	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
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	3	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	8	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/21/2021

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	130	135	165	177	206	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	981
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	3	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	130	135	165	177	206	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	981
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	3	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	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				89%	52%	57%	83%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				78%	55%	58%	64%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	50%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				85%	54%	63%	85%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	57%	62%	69%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	46%	51%	61%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				79%	50%	53%	79%	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	88%	52%	36%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	88%	55%	33%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	89%	54%	35%	56%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	86%	54%	32%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	85%	57%	28%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	85%	54%	31%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	79%	51%	28%	53%	26%
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 will be used as the progress monitoring tool for all grade levels. Formative Assessments for Science Data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	130/50%	130/72%	130/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	57%	89%
	Students With Disabilities	28%	61%	56%
	English Language Learners	0%	33%	33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	130/52%	130/71%	130/89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	53%	82%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	73%	91%
	English Language Learners	7%	20%	60%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	158/59%	158/59%	158/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	62%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	35%	32%
	English Language Learners	33%	67%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	158/49%	158/78%	158/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	56%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	74%	80%	84%
	English Language Learners	47%	53%	87%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	171/68%	171/82%	171/77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	69%	78%
	Students With Disabilities	56%	68%	46%
	English Language Learners	0%	40%	80%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	171/39%	171/65%	171/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	46%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	49%	65%	73%
	English Language Learners	8%	24%	88%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	183/66%	183/68%	183/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	48%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	69%	56%	62%
	English Language Learners	60%	50%	80%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	183/51%	183/66%	183/78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	58%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	67%	71%	70%
	English Language Learners	52%	36%	68%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	218/61%	218/63%	218/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	54%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	55%	47%	49%
	English Language Learners	0%	20%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	218/57%	218/67%	218/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	55%	66%
	Students With Disabilities	72%	69%	69%
	English Language Learners	4%	32%	64%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	218/60%	218/67%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	59%	
	Students With Disabilities	66%	73%	
	English Language Learners	37%	48%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	38			40							
ELL	89			81							
ASN	97	73		97	82		83				
BLK	75			69							
HSP	85	58	50	81	56	36	68				
MUL	90			87							
WHT	82	68	43	85	72	57	73				
FRL	72	54		66	50		56				
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	46	59	50	46	60	52	42				
ELL	71	82		79	82						
ASN	98	89		95	89		87				
BLK	90	76		70	76						
HSP	83	80	58	81	80	59	77				
MUL	84	56		84	78						
WHT	89	77	74	86	81	60	81				
FRL	79	76	81	77	82	78	79				
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	41	46	25	54	54	46	70				
ELL	63			63							
ASN	92	75		94	86		80				
BLK	62	39		73	44						
HSP	82	63	44	76	59	59	79				
MUL	82	68		79	77		80				
WHT	84	65	48	87	71	63	80				
FRL	66	47	17	71	59	55	68				

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	539
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	78
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	72
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
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	89
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	69
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	60
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?

Learning gains for math bottom quartile students fell 1%, from 61% in (2018) to 60% (2019).

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

Math bottom quartile learning 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?

A significant focus was placed on increasing student achievement in reading by PLCs. COVID learning loss.

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

Learning gains for ELA bottom quartile students increase by 27%.

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

ELA bottom quartile students were our school wide focus. Research based instructional strategies were used with fidelity during guided reading and MTSS/Rti to increase student fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. In addition, Tier 1 focus was on differentiation, using common data to identify areas of need within subgroups and across achievement levels by PLCs, to determine appropriate strategies to meet the needs of students within core curriculum.

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

Teachers will be attending Professional Development to successfully implement the Accelerated Learning model to be utilized during small group instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Study Day - Accelerated Learning Model based on needs and review of data.

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

PLC Facilitators and Instructional Leadership Team will review and support data driven instruction. Teachers will meet to determine student needs and develop strategies and interventions that meet the needs of students. Administration will provide feedback during walkthroughs and observations.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Learning gains decreased from 81% in 2018/19 to 69% in 2020/21, learning gains for bottom quartile decreased from 60% in 2018/19 to 50% in 2020/21.

Measurable Outcome:

We will increase school wide learning gains in reading from 69% to 72%; with an intentional focus on increasing learning gains for the bottom quartile students increasing from 50% to 60%.

Monitoring:

PLCs will meet monthly to review data from I-Ready diagnostic/progress and math monthly assessments to determine best practices including small group instruction and accelerated learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We are going to increase bottom quartile student learning gains in math by differentiating instruction using the Blended Learning Model, Innovative Technology, and Achievement Level Descriptors to engage all students in significant learning and address unfinished learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Blended Learning allows for increase differentiation, engagement, and student accountability. Through daily small group instruction and the use of individualized, adaptive technology, teachers are better able to engage students in significant learning. Utilization of Acceleration during small group math instruction to address student's unfinished learning in relation to their mastery of the grade level standards; identifying, reteaching & monitoring mastery of the skills directly impacting student's success in mastering current grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review and Analyze 2021 school wide data to determine goals and actions steps.
2. Review previous actions steps used to significantly increase learning gains in math and reading prior to COVID.
3. PLC/ILT Facilitators review baseline data to determine PD & ongoing support needs.
4. Ongoing Teacher led Professional Development of strategies and practices that provide opportunities to increase differentiation, student engagement, and unfinished learning (Acceleration).
5. Admin walk-through for feedback and support (Sept - May)
6. PLC led learning walks to support Acceleration (October/March)
6. Progress monitoring of SIP Goals: monthly PLCs, Quarterly Data Reviews with Admin and mid-year Data Chats.
7. Formative Assessments: District Formatives, I-Ready, Math Monthly Assessments, Grade Level Common Assessments FSA.

Person Responsible

Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning gains decreased from 78% in 2018/19 to 67% in 2020/21, learning gains for bottom quartile decreased from 67% in 2018/19 to 46% in 2020/21.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase school wide learning gains in reading from 67% to 70%; with an intentional focus on increasing learning gains for the bottom quartile students increasing from 46% to 70%.
Monitoring:	PLC led data review for trends and discussions of action steps implemented to increase outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use high leverage strategies such as close reading, reciprocal teaching and student lead discussions to increase meta-cognitive and comprehension skills through a wide variety of rich & relevant text to build background knowledge and increase student engagement. We will use Acceleration during small group reading instruction to address unfinished learning in direct relation to student's mastery of grade level standards, identifying, reteaching & monitoring mastery of the skills directing impacting student's success in mastering current grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using these strategies in guided reading the previous year, student achievement in reading increased by 6%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review and Analyze 2021 school wide data to determine goals and actions steps.
2. Review previous actions steps used to significantly increase learning gains in math and reading prior to COVID.
3. PLC/ILT Facilitators review baseline data to determine PD & ongoing support needs.
4. Ongoing Teacher led Professional Development of strategies and practices that provide opportunities to increase differentiation, student engagement, and unfinished learning (Acceleration).
5. Admin walk-through for feedback and support (Sept - May)
6. PLC led learning walks to support Acceleration (October/March)
6. Progress monitoring of SIP Goals: monthly PLCs, Quarterly Data Reviews with Admin and mid-year Data Chats.
7. Formative Assessments: District Formatives, I-Ready, Math Monthly Assessments, Grade Level Common Assessments FSA.

Person Responsible Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Based on TNTP Survey, 7.5/10 overall rating for Professional Development.

Measurable Outcome: 2022 HCPS TNPT Survey will reflect 8.0/10 or higher rate of satisfaction with efforts to build strong relationships with all stakeholders.

Monitoring: The results of the area of focus will be monitored using the 2022 HCPS TNPT Survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

ILT will provide differentiated professional development based on the district initiatives and school wide needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers are more motivated and engaged in Professional Development (PD) when they play a role in determining PD. ILT & PLC is made up of team leaders who communicate directly with peers to determine specific grade level and content area needs to provide effective and differentiated PD for teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review 2021 TNPT Data to determine strengths and opportunities for improvement.
2. Differentiated PD provided by grade level and content area leaders on BEST Standards on PSD.
3. PLC Facilitators will assess the needs of grade levels and work with ILT to provide differentiated instruction and on-going support throughout the year.
4. Administration will use walk-through and observation data support school-wide PD needs.

Person

Responsible Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

PSLT meets monthly to monitor students with behavior plans and mental health struggles. We update/adjust plans as needed and progress monitor growth based on those plans. We also use SEL survey to identify additional needs and address those needs through classroom lessons, group and individual counseling as needed. We will monitor success using the Spring SEL survey. McKitrick Elementary had 0.5 incidents per 100 students and zero (0) suspensions.

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.

- * Open House/Meet and Greet
- * New Family Meet and Greet
- * Curriculum Nights
- * Math Night
- * Literacy Night
- * Health/Safety Fair
- * Kindergarten Art Display
- * Grandparents Breakfast
- * Spring Festival
- * All-Pro Dads Monthly Meetings
- * Conference Nights/Bi-Annual
- * PTA Family Fun Nights/Monthly
- * Monthly Character Awards Assembly
- * 4th/5th Annual NJHS Induction Night
- * Fall/Spring Clubs
- * PTA Volunteer/Tutor Training
- * Student Mentor Program
- * Student Council
- * Talent Show

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

Time has been built into the master schedule to address SEL needs. Classroom teachers hold restorative circles to strengthen relationships weekly. This also helps to identify students who need additional support services. The Culture and Climate committee meets monthly to monitor the success of school wide PBIS making any adjustments as needed. In addition, we are working to plan growth celebrations for each grade level. SAC Members (Teachers/Parents) meet to review school wide PBIS and provide input/support for student incentives.