Pride Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pride Elementary School

10310 LIONS DEN DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Paulette English

Start Date for this Principal: 1/27/2020

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)	28%
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 (77%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (67%)
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

Pride Elementary School

10310 LIONS DEN DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[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	23%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

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.

Pride Elementary will prepare students for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pride Elementary will provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

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
English, Paulette	Principal	Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches) The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement. Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development. Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact. Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions
Alvarez, Christopher	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of the school.
Noll, Elizabeth	SAC Member	The SAC Chair supports the school improvement efforts at the school and facilitates the School Advisory Council.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/27/2020, Paulette English

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

841

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

8

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

12

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	104	150	137	127	141	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	3	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	1	0	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	1	1	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	131	136	129	126	148	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	814
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	5	3	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	131	136	129	126	148	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	814
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	5	3	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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				86%	52%	57%	79%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				78%	55%	58%	72%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	50%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	54%	63%	79%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				79%	57%	62%	70%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	46%	51%	49%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	50%	53%	69%	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	85%	52%	33%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	89%	55%	34%	58%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	88%	57%	31%	64%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	60%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	77%	51%	26%	53%	24%
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 Proficiency -1st - 5th
Science - 5th grade - Baseline in Fall/ Midyear in Winter

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	59%	76%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	51%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	37%	65%	63%
	English Language Learners	18%	45%	54%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	42%	62%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	33%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	45%	79%
	English Language Learners	18%	18%	54%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	41%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	38%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	45%	65%
	English Language Learners	25%	41%	64%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	33%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	25%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	61%	78%
	English Language Learners	17%	33%	58%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75%	80%	90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60%	67%	82%
	Students With Disabilities	67%	76%	83%
	English Language Learners	43%	54%	64%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	59%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	49%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	55%	55%	70%
	English Language Learners	14%	23%	57%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	68%	70%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	44%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	68%	67%	75%
	English Language Learners	30%	30%	56%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	63%	62%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	40%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	65%	61%	71%
	English Language Learners	40%	40%	56%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	65%	72%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	45%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	74%	74%	83%
	English Language Learners	0%	50%	70%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	57%	70%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	46%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	68%	76%	76%
	English Language Learners	30%	30%	30%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	78.5%	79.46%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	50.70%	50.34%	
	Students With Disabilities	87.20%	86.80%	
	English Language Learners	23.5%	39.08%	

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	32	29	25	35	29	21	11				
ELL	75	68	64	78	80		70				
ASN	93	86	82	97	90		88				
BLK	60	52	27	57	57	38	50				
HSP	70	63		62	38		60				
MUL	68			48							
WHT	77	73		82	58		76				
FRL	61	51	37	57	40	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
SWD	57	76	67	55	67	48	48				
ELL	75	73	63	72	80	75	55				
ASN	95	80		97	88		94				
BLK	72	86		72	62		64				
HSP	72	70	67	63	66	54	55				
MUL	78	80		74	80		80				
WHT	89	78	74	85	84	81	76				
FRL	70	77	68	62	70	57	50				

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	39	54	53	39	41	27	22				
ELL	68	60	52	65	54	38	50				
ASN	97	82		97	80		84				
BLK	66	62	45	66	65	46	60				
HSP	64	55	37	60	58	42	58				
MUL	87	81		77	71		55				
WHT	76	73	59	80	70	60	68				
FRL	64	62	48	60	56	42	55				

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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	536
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	71
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	49
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	60
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	58
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	73
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	48
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?

Our lowest performance was in the bottom 25% with 53% making gains in ELA and 45% making gains in Math. This was a decrease from the prior prior year (2019 - 69% BQ gains in ELA and 64% in BQ Math gains). The 2021 BQ gains in both ELA and Math were similar to the 2018 gains.

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

overall Math gains and BQ ELA and Math 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?

Virtual learning, lack of continuity (switching from virtual to face-to- face and vice versa, change in teacher assignments and high absenteeism) contributed to gaps in learning. Learning gaps will be addressed through acceleration and other differentiated practices.

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

Based on 2019 assessments and other progress monitoring tools, proficiency in ELA and Math did not increase compared to prior, prior year data, but was consistent with proficiency in 2018 and 2017.

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

The increases in both proficiency and gains for the 2019 school year were attributed to focused instruction and targeting students needs through differentiated practices. These practices will continue to be implemented as we transition back to on-campus instruction during the 2021-2022 school year.

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

data driven small group instruction, differentiation, goal setting and monitoring, after school tutoring

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.

Utilizing data to plan for small group instruction
Managing classroom rotations in order to facilitate small group instruction
Understanding BEST standards/planning for instruction & facilitating learning using the BEST standards
Utilizing the Wonders curriculum materials
iReady tools - Prerequisite Reports/Toolbox

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

grade level content and vertical content PLCs
collaborative planning
goal setting
progress monitoring
systematic data review

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A slight decrease in overall proficiency and significant decrease in BQ gains in both ELA and Math indicate that learning gaps will be evident as students are presented with grade level standards. Providing small group instruction will be necessary to accelerate learning.
Measurable Outcome:	BQ Math gains will increase from 45% to 55%. BQ ELA gains will increase from 53% to 58% .
Monitoring:	focused walk-throughs, feedback and follow-up
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Alvarez (christopher.alvarez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Pride Elementary will implement the evidence-based strategy of differentiation through small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's research on influences and effect sizes related to student achievement Scaffolding - .82 Interventions for students with learning needs - .77 clear goal intentions - .48 small group learning - .47

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher survey to determine support/PD needed to successfully implement small groups and accelerate learning

Person Responsible	Paulette English (paulette.english@hcps.net)

Provide professional development on group structures, utilizing data to plan for groups and acceleration.

Person Responsible	Christopher Alvarez (christopher.alvarez@hcps.net)

Create opportunities for teachers to collaborate with colleagues and improve practice.

Person Responsible	Paulette English (paulette.english@hcps.net)

Facilitate the collection of walk-through data regarding facilitating small groups and acceleration (including teacher learning walks/ admin. feedback walkthroughs)

Person Responsible	Paulette English (paulette.english@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.

The school leadership team meets at least twice each month and reviews behavior and discipline data. Information from stakeholder surveys is reviewed. The student support team plans class and small group lessons based on input from stakeholders and review of data.

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.

Pride Elementary utilizes PBIS strategies and actively engages our Student Ambassadors, Student Safety Patrols, School Advisory Council, Leadership Team and PTA in building and supporting a positive school culture and environment.

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

Administration oversees the implementation of all of the programs at Pride Elementary. Our PBIS committee ensures that the procedures of the program are implemented with fidelity and meet regularly to schedule special events in support of PBIS strategies. Our teachers that support our Safety Patrols and Student Ambassadors work with them to be positive role models in promoting a positive culture. The PTA and SAC work closely with the school to reinforce having a positive culture.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00