Hillsborough County Public Schools

Twin Lakes Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Twin Lakes Elementary School

8507 N HABANA AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Daphne Fourqurean

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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

Twin Lakes Elementary School

8507 N HABANA AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[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	92%

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 a safe environment where students' efforts are recognized and they are encouraged to develop skills that enable them to excel in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering a community of learners and leaders.

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
Batista, Kilsys	Principal	The safety and education of all students.
Osborn, JamesL	Assistant Principal	The safety and education of all students.
Purcell, Stephanie	SAC Member	Education of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Daphne Fourqurean

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.*
1

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Total number of students enrolled at the school
565

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	99	86	76	80	82	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	11	3	6	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	31	37	22	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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 8/31/2021

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	82	83	81	107	84	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	512
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	15	26	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	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	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	1	0	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	6	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	82	83	81	107	84	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	512
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	15	26	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	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	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	1	0	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	6	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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				38%	52%	57%	41%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	55%	58%	48%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	50%	53%	42%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				37%	54%	63%	38%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	57%	62%	54%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	46%	51%	46%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	50%	53%	32%	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	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	30%	55%	-25%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	57%	-21%	64%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%
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 was used to monitor students in Reading and Math at grades K-5. We monitored for instruction, growth and proficiency.
Science progress was monitored via district assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	19	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	30	52
	Students With Disabilities	6	25	26
	English Language Learners	10	36	48
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1	15	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	31	57
	Students With Disabilities	6	27	40
	English Language Learners	6	22	54

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	9	11	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	21	33
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	18
	English Language Learners	0	13	22
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	1	1	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	19	34
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	14
	English Language Learners	3	5	14

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	8	14	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	45	49
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	13
	English Language Learners	19	29	34
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	1	4	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	19	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	25
	English Language Learners	7	14	30

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	11	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	26	31
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	6
	English Language Learners	3	10	11
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1	8	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	25	34
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	5	11

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1	3	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	24	37
	Students With Disabilities	0	15	16
	English Language Learners	5	16	19
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	17	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	21	31
	Students With Disabilities	8	0	15
	English Language Learners	6	16	30
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	57	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	34	
	Students With Disabilities	40	47	
	English Language Learners	35	43	

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	28	47		20	59		25				
ELL	42	58	58	35	51		31				
BLK	35	58		31	50		33				
HSP	38	50	57	30	51	53	30				
WHT	45			36							
FRL	37	49	50	29	46	56	32				

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	13	28	32	16	42	38	10				
ELL	31	45	34	37	55	44	49				
BLK	37	38		36	46		33				
HSP	36	46	39	36	54	40	38				
WHT	48	45		37	43		33				
FRL	38	44	35	37	52	41	40				

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	21	34	35	19	41	50					
ELL	36	49	34	31	55	54	20				
ASN	83	73		67	55						
BLK	41	41		42	48						
HSP	38	46	39	36	54	49	30				
WHT	42	50		35	53						
FRL	39	46	43	37	52	47	29				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	92%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	47
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	41
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	45
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	
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	41
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	44
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?

Winter iReady Diagnostic (% at or above grade level, including early in grade level at Standard View)
ELA- 5th is 23% , 4th is 26%, 3rd is 45%, 2nd is 26%, 1st is 32%
Math- 5th is 16%, 4th is 15%, 3rd is 14%, 2nd is 12%, and 1st is 19%

Spring iReady Diagnostic Diagnostic (% at or above grade level, including early in grade level at End-of-Year View)
Overall the school scored ELA – 60% and Math - 45%
ELA -5th is 32%, 4th is 30%, 3rd is 62%, 2nd is 32%, 1st is 49%, K is 85%
Phonological awareness - 88%
Phonics – 60%
High Frequency Words - 88
Vocabulary - 44
Reading Comp – Lit 50
Read Comp – Inf 50
Math – 5th is 29%, 4th is 24%, 3rd is 33%, 2nd is 24%, 1st is 54%, K is 74%
Number & Oper. – 49%
Algebraic Thinking – 45%
Measurement – 43%
Geometry – 43%

Student achievement in winter showed math scores lower than ELA. A possible contributing factor to the trend is the lack of planning focus in providing individualized instruction through small group in math with meaningful connections to support unfinished learning.

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

Student achievement in winter showed math scores lower than ELA. A possible contributing factor to the trend is the lack of planning focus in providing individualized instruction through small group in math with meaningful connections to support unfinished learning. In reviewing the iReady domain specific data, the domain with the lowest percentage of students on level or above is vocabulary at 44%.

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

A contributing factor of the underperformance in vocabulary was lack of instructional strategies to support student learning. Other contributing factors were social distancing and virtual learning environments which inhibited the opportunity for discourse.

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

Student Achievement in spring demonstrated an overall strength in ELA compared to math.

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

Collaborative planning was highly cohesive with a focus on standards-aligned instruction and small group instruction. Small group instruction in ELA focused on High Frequency Words (+17%) and Phonics (+13%) and Math focused on Numbers & Operation (Math +22%)

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

Collaborative planning with Academic coaches.
Job embedded PD within coaching model/planning.
Creation of planning tools that contain specific elements for the grade levels.

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.

Faculty presentations - Elements of Effective Lesson Planning for Instruction
Job embedded PD within coaching/collaborative planning Standards progression
Just in Time vs. Just in case scaffolding (Acceleration) - "If/Then supports"
Standards Aligned Instruction (learning intentions, learning tasks -whole group and independent practice-,
success criteria, evidence of learning)
Faculty professional development focused on Exemplar Rooms that have evidence of communication supports
for students
Learning Walks focused on evidence of the use of interactive strategies
Faculty presentation of WIN notebooks for ELA
Model Thinking routines within weekly Faculty PLC and planning
Faculty Presentation of Visible Thinking Routines overview

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

Ongoing Collaborative planning with Academic Coaches and grade level PLCs that focus on acceleration, teacher clarity, communication and critical thinking strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In response to evidence of learning, adapted instruction will be standards-aligned and include supports that promote communication and critical thinking across content areas. Student achievement in winter showed math scores lower than ELA. A possible contributing factor to the trend is the lack of planning focus in providing individualized instruction through small group in math with meaningful connections to support unfinished learning. Student Achievement in spring demonstrated an overall strength in ELA compared to math. In reviewing the iReady domain specific data, the domain with the lowest percentage of students on level or above is vocabulary at 44%. A contributing factor of the underperformance in vocabulary was lack of instructional strategies to support student learning. Other contributing factors were social distancing and virtual learning environments which inhibited the opportunity for student discourse.
Measurable Outcome:	As measured by the Kindergarten to 5th grade iReady Spring Diagnostic in the 2021-2022 school year, the percent of students on or above grade level will increase from 60% in Reading to 65% (Black 54% to 57%, SWD 24% to 27%) and from 45% to 50% in Math (Black 46% to 49%, SWD 34% to 37%).
Monitoring:	Weekly/monthly monitoring of lesson progress, instructional time, diagnostic performance and diagnostic growth within iReady for school-wide, grade level, teacher, sub-group data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In support of effectively differentiating and monitoring student learning, the following strategies will be implemented: Planning for differentiation (Adapted): standards progressions, selecting and monitoring assessments to identify needs for content differentiation, ways to scaffold (If...then) the learning while maintaining the rigor of the standard. Differentiating supports to increase Communication & Critical thinking: visible thinking maps and routines, learning intentions, vocabulary supports (Frayer model), graphic organizers for oral and written communication.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies identified to support differentiation was based on the research found in "Visible Learning" by: John Hattie, Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey. Communication and discourse to build how students think and express themselves and how they provide critical feedback and formulate own reasoning has an effect size of .82, "High in the Zone of Desired Effect". Scaffolded differentiation will be provided to students to support their ability to communicate and formulate reasoning.
Action Steps to Implement	

A - Adapted Instruction:
Job embedded PD within coaching support to focus on:
Standards progression
Just in Time vs. Just in case scaffolding (Acceleration) - "If/Then supports"
Standards Aligned Instruction (learning intentions, learning tasks -whole group and independent practice-, success criteria, evidence of learning)
Content area coaches to support students (Black and SWD) within the classroom via small group instruction.

C-Communication
Job embedded PD within coaching model/planning to focus on communication tools:

Vocabulary (e.g., Use of Word Wall, Frayer Model, Concept Maps, Words Interactive Notebook)
Visual Supports (e.g., Sentence frames, Interactive Anchor Charts)

CT-Critical Thinking
Job embedded PD within coaching model/planning to focus on:
Visible Thinking Routines

Fidelity of Implementation through Walkthroughs using the Four Principals of Excellent Instruction. (Admin and content area coaches)
Lesson Plans in ELA and Math
IReady Diagnostic- Vocabulary Domain
IReady Growth Monitoring
Math Monthly
ELA Unit Tests
Sub-Groups (Black and SWD) monitored of progress through a global data tracker by PSLT monthly

Person Responsible   Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 40% in grade 3 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher, 28% in grade 4 and 33% in grade 5. This score was due to misalignment of state standards, learning tasks, and success criteria during core instruction. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include standards-aligned instruction with success criteria, accountability, and feedback practices in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on the ELA Spring 2022 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of 3rd grade students scoring at a level 3 or higher on the FSA assessment will increase to 43% as measured by the Spring 2022 ELA FSA. The percent of 4th grade students scoring at a level 3 or higher on the FSA assessment will increase to 31% as measured by the Spring 2022 ELA FSA. The percent of 5th grade students scoring at a level 3 or higher on the FSA assessment will increase to 36% as measured by the Spring 2022 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	Students in grades 3 -5 will be monitored using the iReady Reading Diagnostic administered in the fall, winter, and spring of 2022.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop and implement student success criteria, accountability, and feedback practice in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In 2021, the data showed that less than 41% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher on the ELA FSA. The improvement strategy of developing and implementing student success criteria, accountability, and feedback practice in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement will result in an improvement of student academic performance in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development to teachers that will provide them specific strategies to increase student ownership of work and active engagement during ELA.

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Conduct focused walkthroughs in grades 3-5, providing feedback to teachers on use of success criteria, equitable feedback, and student engagement during ELA.

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Job embedded ELA PD within coaching model/planning to focus on communication tools:
Vocabulary (e.g., Use of Word Wall, Frayer Model, Concept Maps, Words Interactive Notebook)
Visual Supports (e.g., Sentence frames, Interactive Anchor Charts)

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Collaborative planning with teachers in grades 3-5 will be supported by reading resource teachers focused on standards-aligned learning objectives, learning tasks, and success criteria.

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@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 Twin Lakes suspension rate has increase from 13 incidents in 2018-19 to 32 incidents in 2019-20. Student suspension rates will reduce as a result of effective implementation and monitoring of the schoolwide behavior plan.

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.

Twin Lakes invites parents, families, and community stakeholders to school wide events including: Meet the Teacher, STEM Family Night, Literacy Family Night, Chorus concerts, Awards quarterly assembly, Great American Teach In, Volunteer Appreciation, Conference Nights, SAC monthly meetings, ELL Semi-annual Parent meetings, Autism Acceptance Month, and other classroom events.

School-wide behavior plan utilized to set positive expectations for all areas of the school environment.

Student-Teacher-Family Compact is agreed upon at beginning of year and revisited through parent teacher conferences.

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

1. Leadership and Admin. to provide continuous support to new staff through biweekly Onboarding sessions which address individual professional development needs.
2. Academic coaching support for teachers is based on student data and teacher need related to the Teacher Rubric and monitored monthly and adjusted accordingly.
3. Monthly opportunities for feedback and celebrations for students and staff is provided by the school leadership, including academic coaches.
4. Teachers and students follow the schoolwide behavior plan which will include: core values and expectations for learner behaviors, positive reinforcement and logical consequences, individualized behavior plans for students in Tiers 2 and 3, individual and class recognition, weekly class meetings focused on promoting a positive culture for learning. Student response to the behavior plan is monitored

monthly by the PSLT and the Culture Committee.

5. Instructional staff provide opportunities for students to engage in literature that is culturally appropriate through participation in the Global Read Aloud program.

6. Instructional staff provide literature that reflects our students

7. Instructional Staff encourages students to attend school daily by being present and on time. Attendance monitored by classroom teacher, data processor, school social worker and administration.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**