Palm River Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Palm River Elementary School

805 MAYDELL DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Mccluney   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	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: D (35%) 2016-17: D (37%)
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.](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

Palm River Elementary School

805 MAYDELL DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[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	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

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

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.

Palm River Elementary will utilize a strength-based approach to teaching and learning where data drives all instructional and behavioral decisions to positively impact the whole child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Palm River Elementary is to develop well rounded, confident and responsible students who aspire to achieve their full potential. We will do this by providing a welcoming, happy, safe, and supportive learning environment in which everyone is valued and all achievements are celebrated.

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
McCluney, Kelly	Principal	Develops and monitors all SIP areas to improve student achievement outcomes. Consults with various stakeholders to share progress towards SIP goals and modify the plan as needed throughout the school year.
Whitley, Sherry	Instructional Media	Communicates progress of SIPS goals to parents and external stakeholders as the SAC Chair.
Reyes, Yobanec	Assistant Principal	
Edwards, Leniece	Instructional Coach	
Kozlowski, Jaclyn	Instructional Coach	
Ward, Nicole	Math Coach	
Haynes, Sophia	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kelly Mccluney

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.*

13

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

360

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

17

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

18

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	67	73	53	60	48	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
Attendance below 90 percent	39	39	16	19	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	51	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	39	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	44	10	35	32	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	1	3	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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

Thursday 8/12/2021

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	58	61	63	65	72	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	17	19	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	58	61	63	65	72	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	17	19	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				41%	52%	57%	31%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	55%	58%	41%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	50%	53%	29%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	54%	63%	32%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	57%	62%	39%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	46%	51%	41%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	50%	53%	31%	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	36%	52%	-16%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	38%	57%	-19%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	53%	-14%
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 Diagnostic Assessments
District- ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments
District- Math Monthly Assessments
Achieve 3000 Diagnostics
SIPPS
Running Records
DRA
Unit Assessments- Reading, math and science
Midyear Assessments- Reading, math and science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	11	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	11	19
	Students With Disabilities	1	2	3
	English Language Learners	1	0	4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	12	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	10	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	0
	English Language Learners	3	4	7

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	5	10
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	5	9
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	2	0	9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1	2	2
	Economically Disadvantaged	1	2	2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	12	14
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	10	12
	Students With Disabilities	1	2	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	2	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	2	5
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	3
	English Language Learners	0	1	0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4	4	5
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	4	5
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	2
	English Language Learners	0	1	1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	2	1
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	2	0
	Students With Disabilities	2	2	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	6	10
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	6	10
	Students With Disabilities	3	2	4
	English Language Learners	0	1	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	6	9
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	6	9
	Students With Disabilities	3	3	4
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	41.5	34.94	
	Economically Disadvantaged	41.5	33.6	
	Students With Disabilities	20.3	23.13	
	English Language Learners	39.95	33.6	

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	19		10	13		13				
ELL	24	15		20	15		19				
BLK	17	22		22	17		11				
HSP	31	22		28	14		25				
WHT	26			29							
FRL	26	25	27	25	17	40	22				
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	51	58	28	54	67	32				
ELL	40	50	45	45	61		42				
BLK	36	47	60	37	48	43	44				
HSP	46	58	56	48	58		41				

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	36	63		44	44						
FRL	42	55	56	43	54	45	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	20	45	33	26	38	46	35				
ELL	27	29	14	31	43	67	19				
BLK	24	38	47	30	36	26	22				
HSP	37	43	11	36	49	56	38				
MUL	10										
WHT	46	47		38	29		40				
FRL	31	41	29	32	39	40	30				

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	28
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	224
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	22
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	18
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	27
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	28
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
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?

The lowest data component from the 2018-2019 school year are students with disabilities with 27% proficiency in ELA and 20% proficiency in mathematics. A contributing factor was the lack of rapid interventions for targeted groups of students who have significant learning gaps or who lack key foundational skills. This particular subgroup of students did show growth in overall gains and in the lowest 25% gains.

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

The lowest data component from 2021 FSA data were our math and reading learning gains. In ELA, our learning decreased from 54% to 25% and in math our learning gains decreased from 54% to 17%.

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 COVID pandemic beginning March of 2020, we have dealt with high numbers of families and students being negatively impacted by COVID. During this time, over half of our students were utilizing the eLearning model. This model presented many challenges for our families such as being able to support their child academically. Some families that selected this model experienced many challenges with internet and technology issues resulting in lack of students engaged in daily learning and significant number of daily absences in Kindergarten- 5th grade.
.

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

Our math bottom quartile experienced the lowest decrease from 43% to 40%.

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

Our math coach supported our bottom quartile students with small group instruction. Planning sessions focused on providing scaffolded support to ensure progress towards mastery of the standards and daily intended learning outcomes.

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

Explicit Modeling- When teachers adopt explicit teaching practices they clearly show students what to do and how to do it. The teacher decides on learning intentions and success criteria, makes them transparent to students, and demonstrates them by modelling. The teacher checks for understanding, and at the end of each lesson revisits what was covered and ties it all together (Hattie, 2009)
• Direct instruction – 0.59
• Teacher clarity – 0.75

Feedback- Feedback informs a student and/or teacher about the student's performance relative to learning goals. Feedback redirects or refocuses teacher and student actions so the student can align

effort and activity with a clear outcome that leads to achieving a learning goal. Teachers and peers can provide formal or informal
feedback. It can be oral, written, formative or summative. Whatever its form, it comprises specific advice a student can use to improve performance.
• Feedback – 0.73

Questioning- Questioning is a powerful tool and effective teachers regularly use it for a range of purposes. It engages students, stimulates interest and curiosity in the learning, and makes links to students' lives. Questioning opens up opportunities for students to discuss, argue, and express opinions and alternative points of view. Effective questioning yields immediate feedback on student understanding, supports informal and
formative assessment, and captures feedback on effectiveness of teaching strategies.
• Questioning – 0.46

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.

Driven by Data 2.0- Data-driven instruction is the philosophy that schools should focus on two simple questions: how do you know if are students learning? And when they are not, what do you do about it? Driven by Data 2.0 is a practical guide that answers these questions to empower schools to achieve significant gains in student achievement.
Assess—set the roadmap for learning
Analyze—identify why students struggle
Act—teach more effectively what students need
Build the culture—train and develop your staff so that data-driven instruction can thrive

Get Better Faster- It's the book's focus on the actionable—the practice-able—that drives effective coaching. By practicing the concrete actions and micro-skills listed here, teachers will markedly improve their ability to lead a class, producing a steady chain reaction of future teaching success.

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

Strong resource team consisting of reading coach, reading resource, math coach, and MTSS resource. This team will use their expertise to coach and guide students to strengthen the core instruction. We also have an behavior leadership team that will influence the overall mindset and culture of the school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Spring iReady Diagnostic data indicated 60% of Kindergarten- 5th grade students received an overall placement in literacy of one or more years below grade level indicating that the majority of our students are not meeting the instructional requirements to be considered proficient on their grade level standards. Spring 2021 ELA and Mathematics FSA data indicated 74% of 3rd-5th grade students received a Level 1 or 2 achievement score. Essential practices such as explicitly modeling instructional strategies, promoting student discourse through quality questioning, offering feedback to students that address misconceptions and making adjustments throughout the lesson will be implemented to ensure students are progressing towards mastery of the intended learning target and grade level standards resulting in student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	By December 2021, 70% of Kindergarten- 5th Grade teachers will use evidence of explicit modeling as indicated in our actionable look-fors through classroom observations by district personnel, administration and academic coaches. By Spring 2022, 100% of students in grades Kindergarten-5 will show a years growth by reaching and/or exceeding their iReady typical growth measure from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 3.
Monitoring:	The following area of focus will monitored through: Data collected during core instruction as aligned with instructional look-fors Scaffolded, targeted, intentional small group instruction with a specific standard/skill focus Learning acceleration Analyze data and implement needed interventions according to student data from ELA and mathematics mini-assessments, unit tests and district PMA's Students applying and articulating use of instructional strategies to text and problem-solving as demonstrated by teacher during explicit modeling Student responding to text verbally and in written form Students showing multiple ways to solve a problem through computations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit Modeling- When teachers adopt explicit teaching practices they clearly show students what to do and how to do it. The teacher decides on learning intentions and success criteria, makes them transparent to students, and demonstrates them by modelling. The teacher checks for understanding, and at the end of each lesson revisits what was covered and ties it all together (Hattie, 2009) • Direct instruction – 0.59 • Teacher clarity – 0.75 Feedback- Feedback informs a student and/or teacher about the student's performance relative to learning goals. Feedback redirects or refocuses teacher and student actions so the student can align effort and activity with a clear outcome that leads to achieving a learning goal. Teachers and peers can provide formal or informal feedback. It can be oral, written, formative or summative. Whatever its form, it comprises specific

advice a student can use to improve performance.
• Feedback – 0.73

Questioning- Questioning is a powerful tool and effective teachers regularly use it for a range of purposes. It engages students, stimulates interest and curiosity in the learning, and makes links to students' lives. Questioning opens up opportunities for students to discuss, argue, and express opinions and alternative points of view. Effective questioning yields immediate feedback on student understanding, supports informal and formative assessment, and captures feedback on effectiveness of teaching strategies.
• Questioning – 0.46

<table>
<tr><td>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</td><td>The research based work of John Hattie's Visible Learning refers to making student learning visible to teachers so they can know whether they are having an impact on student learning. It also refers to making teaching visible to the student as well so that students learn to become their own teachers, an important component of becoming lifelong learners – something we want students to value. Teaching and learning are visible when the learning goal is not only challenging but is explicit. When implementing visible learning instructional strategies, both the teacher and the student work together to attain the goal, provide feedback, and ascertain whether the student has attained the goal. Evidence shows that the greatest effects on student learning come when the students become their own teachers In successful classrooms, both the teaching and learning are visible.</td></tr>
</table>

Action Steps to Implement

Design master schedule to include common grade level collaborative planning sessions centered on standards-based planning to accelerate student learning. Create and implement planning protocols that will be utilized to structure planning sessions to support the understanding of the intent and rigor of the grade level standards

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Administer district baseline assessments (foundational skills, fluency and reading comprehension) to gain quick information on students unfinished learning in prerequisite skills and knowledge. Leadership team will analyze formative data to understand current state of students learning while identifying the content knowledge and skills students may struggle with within their current grade level. Engage teachers in data deep drive to analyze to prioritize the most critical prerequisite skills and adjust grade level curriculum scope and sequence pacing guides according to students needs.

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Engage instructional personnel in professional development focused on explicit modeling and task alignment to standards to plan for core instruction as indicated by the data drive.

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Academic coaches will facilitate weekly grade professional learning communities to help build and develop content and best instructional practices.

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Weekly grade level plc's will analyze student instructional task to determine student progress towards intended learning outcome, mastery of grade level standards and what misconceptions students are

demonstrating that is preventing them from achieving proficiency. Tiered levels of intervention will be implemented according to student data.

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Students track their own goals and progress data, know their current level of proficiency, and receive frequent feedback on their performance and areas of improvement.

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Administration will conduct daily walk-thoughs to progress monitor explicit modeling and task alignment to grade level standards. Administration will provide immediate feedback to coach teachers. Administration will meet weekly with academic coaches to discuss walk-though observations/feedback to progress monitor implementation of collaborative planning sessions and impact of coaching cycles.

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Leadership and ILT will progress monitor formative district assessment K-5th grade with a targeted focus on ESSA subgroups below 41%. Staff will participate in quarterly data check-ins to progress monitor school-wide progress towards to gains in student proficiency, learning gains and ESSA subgroups.

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 25% in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency-level 3 or higher. The score was due to lost learning due to eLearning, isolation and quarantine during the year. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include standards-based planning, instructional tasks alignment to intended learning outcome and rigor of task, explicit modeling of instructional strategies to support standards, acceleration and scaffolding practices resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of 3-5 grade students scoring at a level 3 or higher on FSA will increase to 50% as measured by ELA FSA scores.
Monitoring:	The following area of focus will monitored through: Data collected during core instruction as aligned with instructional look-fors Scaffolded, targeted, intentional small group instruction with a specific standard/skill focus Learning acceleration Analyze data and implement needed interventions according to student data from ELA and mathematics mini-assessments, unit tests and district PMA's Students applying and articulating use of instructional strategies to text and problem-solving as demonstrated by teacher during explicit modeling Student responding to text verbally and in written form Daily Classroom Walk throughs Coaching cycles Targeted professional development according to observed needs Quarterly 3rd-5th teacher data chats Student data chats iReady, Imagine Learning and Achieve 3000
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The research based work of John Hattie's Visible Learning refers to making student learning visible to teachers so they can know whether they are having an impact on student learning. It also refers to making teaching visible to the student as well so that students learn to become their own teachers, an important component of becoming lifelong learners – something we want students to value. Teaching and learning are visible when the learning goal is not only challenging but is explicit. When implementing visible learning instructional strategies, both the teacher and the student work together to attain the goal, provide feedback, and ascertain whether the student has attained the goal. Evidence shows that the greatest effects on student learning come when the students become their own teachers In successful classrooms, both the teaching and learning are visible.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit Modeling- When teachers adopt explicit teaching practices they clearly show students what to do and how to do it. The teacher decides on learning intentions and success criteria, makes them transparent to students, and demonstrates them by modelling. The teacher checks for understanding, and at the end of each lesson revisits what was covered and ties it all together (Hattie, 2009) • Direct instruction – 0.59 • Teacher clarity – 0.75 Feedback- Feedback informs a student and/or teacher about the student's performance relative to learning goals. Feedback redirects or refocuses teacher and student actions so

the student can align effort and activity with a clear outcome that leads to achieving a learning goal. Teachers and peers can provide formal or informal
feedback. It can be oral, written, formative or summative. Whatever its form, it comprises specific
advice a student can use to improve performance.
• Feedback – 0.73

Questioning- Questioning is a powerful tool and effective teachers regularly use it for a range of purposes. It engages students, stimulates interest and curiosity in the learning, and makes links to students' lives. Questioning opens up opportunities for students to discuss, argue, and express opinions and alternative points of view. Effective questioning yields immediate feedback on student understanding, supports informal and
formative assessment, and captures feedback on effectiveness of teaching strategies.
• Questioning – 0.46

Teacher Clarity- Consistent and frequent planning, data analysis, and PLCs that are centered around the
standards aligned instruction will have provide teachers with clarity and have a high impact on student achievement.
• Teacher Clarity – 0.75

Action Steps to Implement

Design master schedule to include common grade level collaborative planning sessions centered on standards-based planning to accelerate student learning. Create and implement planning protocols that will be utilized to structure planning sessions to support the understanding of the intent and rigor of the grade level standards

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Academic coaches will facilitate weekly grade professional learning communities to help build and develop content and best instructional practices.

Person Responsible Kelly McCluney (kelly.mccluney@hcps.net)

Weekly grade level plc's will analyze student instructional task to determine student progress towards intended learning outcome, mastery of grade level standards and what misconceptions students are demonstrating that is preventing them from achieving proficiency. Tiered levels of support will be implemented according to student data.

Person Responsible Sophia Haynes (sophia.haynes@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.

Palm River Elementary listed as a very high incident reporting school according to Safe School for Alex website. Over a three year span, we reported 37 out-of-school suspensions. To address this data, we established a Behavior Leadership Team to implement multiple formal structures through which school values and expected behaviors are taught and reinforced; daily rewards and consequences are published and shared widely.
Create Tier 1 behavior and accountability system was implemented in August of 2021 to explicitly teach, review and reinforce expected behaviors Infractions are addressed in a consistent manner, and hold staff responsible for consistently implementing rewards and consequences with all students, not only those they directly teach.
Our guidance counselor conducts weekly grade level Second Steps lessons that address managing emotions and teaching of social skills. Teachers are provided on-going targeted support on classroom management and positive behavior systems and strategies by RtI Resource teacher along with reviewing behavior tracker and referral data bi-weekly at leadership meetings to progress monitor school wide behavior data and tiered student needs while engaging in the problem-solving process as necessary.

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.

Palm River strives to maintain a healthy and positive school culture and environment by our collective vision, mission and core values. Our school is committed to ensuring all stakeholders feel seen, valued, and heard. Our students are provided with multiple opportunities to demonstrate leadership skills through their daily interactions and opportunities in the classroom with classroom jobs and leadership roles. We empowering teachers to actively seek teacher leadership roles and responsibilities. In our school, we have champion teams (physical environment, empowering instruction, social emotional learning, direct lessons, leadership roles, new and ongoing staff learning, and family and community partnerships) where everyone in the school serves on a team. Staff members choose their teams based on passions; then, set goals, action steps, and celebrate when meeting their goals. These teams drive our school improvement plan, which means teachers are making the decisions to execute the mission and vision of the school. Their ownership of who we are creates a sense of pride. Communication and positive parent interactions are other critical elements in building and maintaining a positive school culture.

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

The stakeholders play an important role in managing schools. They are the partners of the school leaders in making the schools conducive to teaching and learning. They are also responsible for the achievement of the learning outcomes through their active participation in school activities, programs and projects. 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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00