Davis Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Davis Elementary School

10907 MEMORIAL HWY, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Patrick Lalone

Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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

Davis Elementary School

10907 MEMORIAL HWY, Tampa, FL 33615

[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	87%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

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 provide opportunities for students to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to ensure a standard of excellence in developing each student, academically, emotionally and socially.

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
LaLone, Patrick	Principal	Ensure the goals and activities of this SIP are conveyed to parents, staff and community. To ensure the implementation of all activities.
Brescia, Cristina	Reading Coach	To help implement academic Goals and Activities throughout the school. To provide support to teachers with academic Goals and Activities.
Wilsey, Adriana	Math Coach	To help implement academic Goals and Activities throughout the school. To provide support to teachers with academic Goals and Activities.
Willis, Kirsten	Other	To help implement academic Goals and Activities throughout the school. To provide support to teachers with academic Goals and Activities. Also to provide support for specific academic interventions.
Geary, Marci	Other	To help implement academic Goals and Activities throughout the school. To provide support to teachers with academic Goals and Activities. Provide support for students who receive Exceptional Student Education services.
Lazzara, Yvette	Other	To help implement academic Goals and Activities throughout the school. To provide support to teachers with academic Goals and Activities. Provide support for ELL students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 9/1/2012, Patrick Lalone

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.*

6

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

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

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

6

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

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	60	76	96	83	85	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	32	20	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	34	33	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	38	35	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	6	3	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	95	82	97	100	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	7	27	20	16	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	16	2	5	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	95	82	97	100	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	7	27	20	16	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	16	2	5	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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				49%	52%	57%	49%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	55%	58%	51%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	50%	53%	41%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	54%	63%	47%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	57%	62%	51%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	46%	51%	36%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	50%	53%	46%	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	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%
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 Relative Placement to Grade. AP1, AP2, AP3 - All Grades

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	31	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	30	42
	Students With Disabilities	23	29	27
	English Language Learners	12	22	27
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	39	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	38	59
	Students With Disabilities	20	36	56
	English Language Learners	9	22	52

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	44	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	44	54
	Students With Disabilities	32	37	54
	English Language Learners	17	30	43
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	42	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	60	67
	Students With Disabilities	42	49	54
	English Language Learners	34	39	48

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	61	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	60	67
	Students With Disabilities	42	49	54
	English Language Learners	34	39	48
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	30	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	29	51
	Students With Disabilities	24	33	45
	English Language Learners	2	19	33

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	54	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	53	60
	Students With Disabilities	41	43	46
	English Language Learners	28	31	38
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	30	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	28	44
	Students With Disabilities	17	26	37
	English Language Learners	5	14	25

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	59	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	58	63
	Students With Disabilities	51	54	58
	English Language Learners	37	47	56
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	27	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	27	37
	Students With Disabilities	19	29	37
	English Language Learners	11	20	26
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	41	
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	40	
	Students With Disabilities	36	42	
	English Language Learners	17	31	

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	12	17	9	24	42	30	22				
ELL	35	54		36	37	40	27				
BLK	27			27							
HSP	40	43	30	38	39	44	30				
WHT	42			68							
FRL	37	35	28	40	43	47	25				
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	27	42	38	27	38	23	24				
ELL	42	54	53	41	54	37	39				
BLK	30	46		40	48		27				
HSP	49	58	49	45	49	33	45				

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
WHT	49	58	54	60	69		65				
FRL	47	57	47	47	52	31	45				
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	25	31	33	28	35	28	22				
ELL	30	48	50	34	42	21	19				
BLK	46	55		29	40						
HSP	48	51	47	46	50	34	42				
MUL	80			50							
WHT	50	38	10	52	56		55				
FRL	47	49	40	45	50	37	43				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	330
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	88%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	42
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	
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	27
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	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

Learning gains in both ELA and Math decreased. Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners' Learning Gains were significantly below the gains of other student sub-groups. Reading, Math and Science proficiency dropped in grades 3-5 based on FSA data.

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

Bottom quartile Learning gains. Proficiency in Math and ELA for students with disabilities and English Language Learners.

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

Due to the pandemic, many students learning remotely, and students transitioning between eLearning and Brick and Mortar throughout the school year, most students did not receive consistent instruction. Most students have returned to Brick and Mortar learning and are receiving consistent quality education.

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

Each grade level made consistent improvements in each academic area based on progress monitoring data.

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

The teachers were able to make up for the lost instruction from the previous school year. Teachers assessed student needs and provided differentiated instruction during the year.

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

Effective small group instructional practices will need to be implemented in all grade levels.
Continuous data analysis will target the areas for acceleration.
Lessons will need to be student led with opportunities for productive struggle.

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.

District academic coaches will provide PD on effective strategies to utilize during small group instruction.
School based academic coaches will provide mini workshops on effective strategies to develop teacher pedagogy: High order questioning, student led discussions, productive struggle/rigor.

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

Instructional Learning Team (ILT) will meet monthly to discuss feedback from district walk throughs and develop strategies and PD to implement suggested best practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will use data based decision making to drive instructional practices. This will be done through formative assessments within lessons. The rationale is based on the the following data: students in the ELA Bottom Quartile made 28% gains and the Students with Disabilities sub-group are under the 41% threshold. Students in the Math Bottom Quartile made 47% gains and all of the subgroups are under the 41% threshold.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the bottom quartile and targeted subgroups (Students With Disabilities and Black/African American) will make a 10% gain in proficiency and learning gains.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by informal and formal classroom walkthroughs by school administration, school based academic coaches, and district academic coaches. Progress Monitoring Data will also be monitored throughout the year with a focus on the bottom quartile and targeted subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use formative assessments and scaffolding strategies within their lessons to drive instructional practices and accelerate learning. Professional development will be provided to teachers based on current best practices and evidence-based strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Formative assessment is a planned process in which assessment-elicited evidence of students' status is used by teachers to adjust their ongoing instructional procedures or by students to adjust their current learning tactics. There are many research studies that support the use of Formative assessments to improve student achievement. Evidence based research can be found in the following article: Klute, M., Apthorp, H., Harlacher, J., & Reale, M. (2017). Formative assessment and elementary school student academic achievement: A review of the evidence (REL 2017–259). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide Professional Development on utilizing formative assessments during lessons and using the results to provide differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Teachers will participate in planning sessions with academic coaches to develop effective formative assessments and to plan instructional strategies based on the data.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Leadership Team will analyze the students in the bottom quartile monthly to ensure that they are receiving additional support in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Teachers will implement effective small group instruction. after they plan with district and school-based academic coaches.

Person Responsible   Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 40% in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to students not being consistently challenged with high level questioning and student led discussions. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include purposeful planning that will produce higher order questioning and improved student discussions, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on the FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students scoring at Level 3 or higher on the FSA assessment will increase to 50%.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored by school admin, school based academic coaches, and district academic coaches through classroom walkthroughs and data reviews.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase the effectiveness of higher order questioning that leads to productive student conversation and provides a window into student misconceptions and understandings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In 2021, the data showed a decrease of 9 percentage points in the ELA section of the FSA. The improvement strategy of teachers planning for an increased use of higher order questions and student discourse, will result in an improved student academic performance in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement	

Add to the planning protocol for teachers to come to the weekly planning sessions with suggested higher order discussion questions chosen from the 3-5 Instructional Guides. This is a part of the Before, During, & After tasks.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Introduce teachers to Webb's Depths of Knowledge in their weekly planning session. Review the verbs and sample tasks. DRT will model in planning how to build rich questions that can lead to various collaborative structures to promote discussion amongst students. In addition, suggestions for talk moves and sentence frames will be provided. Utilize questions from 3-5 Instructional Guides to check level of depth for each question chosen to use during the lesson.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Monitor the implementation of the use of higher order questions and discussions amongst students. Provide feedback to teachers on the overall effectiveness of this strategy on student learning. Teacher, DRT, and Site Base Coach will debrief after the lessons and create next steps.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Conduct coaching cycles with teachers around the implementation of higher order questions and discussions among students. Support teachers in the development of anchor charts to promote discussions, selecting an appropriate collaborative structure and/or modeling for students how to use accountable talk stems.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

School Admin monitor the accuracy of effective use of higher order questions with productive struggle through focused administrative walk throughs. Provide feedback to teachers on these components.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

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.

DAVIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-0056 reported 1.9 incidents per 100 students. This rate is greater than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students.

We will use the activities and personnel stated in section IV. Positive Culture & Environment to monitor and decrease the rate of incidents at Davis so that they are more aligned with the state average.

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.

Davis Elementary builds positive relations with parents through ongoing communication in both English and Spanish. We will hold several events throughout the year that provide support for parents with their child's learning and also to recognize their child's accomplishments. Davis Elementary actively pursues business partnerships within our community. After we have established partnerships within our community, we have our partners serve on our School Advisory Council and PTA. Our community partners also mentor students and provide incentives for students and staff.
We have a school-wide behavior program - PBIS. This program is infused throughout the school and enables students to be recognized and rewarded for positive school behavior and ensuring we have a supportive school culture.
We have a positive referral program "Deserving Dragons" where teachers recognize students

for being a positive role model. The students are recognized in the office and their parents are called.
We have monthly "Student of the Month" breakfasts where a student from each classroom is selected for positively demonstrating the character trait of the month. Parents are invited to the breakfast.

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

Principal and Assistant Principal monitor the school culture and environment throughout the year. This is done by analyzing behavior data, staff and student SEL questionnaires, parent input.

RTI Specialist runs and maintains the schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions Supports (PBIS) program.

School Counselor runs the "Student of the Month" program. They also provide Social Emotional Learning support throughout the year. This is done through individual counseling and classroom lessons.

School Social Worker and School Psychologist also provide individualized counseling as need throughout the school year.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**