

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary

12961 BOGGY CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33579

<http://dawson.mysdhc.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Jesha Womack

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	47%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary

12961 BOGGY CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33579

<http://dawson.mysdhc.org/>

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 KG-5	No	42%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

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.

Together as a school family, we will foster a collaborative, trusting, and safe learning community to equitably meet the needs of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing HOPE for our future, one child at a time.

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
Mc Laughlin, Derrick	Principal	Oversee the overall mission, vision and goals of the school.
Arzola, Sara	ELL Compliance Specialist	Oversees the planning, implementation, and monitoring of ELL classified students.
Carey, Wendy	Teacher, PreK	Responsible for creating monthly agendas and running the "business" of the meetings.
Leopold, Sarah	Instructional Coach	Responsible for planning, implementation, and monitoring of ELA instruction.
Moreno, Nelly	Instructional Coach	Responsible for the planning, implementation, and monitoring of Math and Science instruction.
Washington, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE	Responsible for the planning, implementation, and monitoring of ESE/IEP related services.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Jesha Womack

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.*

0

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

913

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

2

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

13

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	137	144	159	155	139	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	877
Attendance below 90 percent	1	20	25	16	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	21	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	3	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

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	100	106	114	122	126	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	697
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	19	11	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	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	5	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	100	106	114	122	126	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	697
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	19	11	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	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	5	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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				50%	52%	57%	50%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	55%	58%	47%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	50%	53%	38%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				40%	54%	63%	56%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				31%	57%	62%	60%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	46%	51%	53%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	50%	53%	55%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	57%	-22%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%
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 Diagnostics (fall, winter, spring) - Reading & Math

Science Formatives (fall, winter, spring) - School City

For grades 3-5 Spring is FSA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	35	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	26	39
	Students With Disabilities	13	27	50
	English Language Learners	0	8	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	22	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	16	30
	Students With Disabilities	7	33	44
	English Language Learners	0	0	9
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	35	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	26	36
	Students With Disabilities	5	15	30
	English Language Learners	0	10	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	22	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	16	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	5

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	31	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	23	44
	Students With Disabilities	5	10	27
	English Language Learners	0	0	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	16	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	12	31
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	18
	English Language Learners	0	0	11
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	24	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	18	33
	Students With Disabilities	4	11	32
	English Language Learners	8	8	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	7	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	5	36
	Students With Disabilities	4	4	43
	English Language Learners	0	8	17

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	19	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	13	37
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	13
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	8	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	6	39
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	6
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	48	n/a	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	n/a	33
	Students With Disabilities	28	n/a	13
	English Language Learners	29	n/a	0

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	30	10	7	25	32	36	17				
ELL	26	25		30	40						
ASN	70			100							
BLK	42	47		35	44		41				
HSP	42	31	18	36	40	25	21				
MUL	57			50							
WHT	55	37	17	53	46	36	54				
FRL	37	28	15	38	43	35	33				
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	22	52	63	15	36	50					
ELL	23	41		20	19						

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
BLK	52	63		36	23		29				
HSP	41	40	20	30	26	25	32				
MUL	54	41		62	41		36				
WHT	54	57	65	42	31	33	51				
FRL	32	46	52	29	30	32	32				
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	22	35	31	31	62	56	29				
ELL	13	38	47	27	58	60	17				
BLK	56	36		50	70		47				
HSP	35	46	38	39	49	67	37				
MUL	39	33		61	67						
WHT	57	54	41	63	60	40	69				
FRL	35	41	38	40	57	55	43				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	85
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	42
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	30
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	54
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	43
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	33
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?

We have seen a downward trend in Math scores, however this past year our Math gains increased. We continue to see lower performance among our SWD, ELL, Hispanic, and FRL subgroups.

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

The area of English Language Learner showed the lowest performance measure (27%). Additionally, the subgroups of SWD, Hispanic students, and FRL have showed persistent low performance.

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

This is the second year in a row that our data was below 32% in this area Instruction was not differentiated enough for students in this subgroup.

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

In the area of ELA learning gains in the bottom quartile (lowest 25%) of the subgroup of SWD, Dawson saw an increase of 32 percentage points.

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

This is attributed to an increase of ESE services and differentiated instruction by adequately trained educators.

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

Teachers will utilize prerequisite assessments to gather data on specific student needs and areas of strength to best plan for acceleration.

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.

Teachers will receive ongoing training and coaching in how to PLAN for acceleration in daily lessons.

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

This year, we have two "Teacher Talent Developers" (TTD). They will coach, model, and plan with teachers to best serve the needs of all through acceleration.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction will be standards aligned in order for students to be engaged in BOTH whole group on-grade level learning tasks and small group/individualized acceleration. The rationale for this area of focus can be explained through our persistent underperformance specifically in the area of general student proficiency (Reading, Math, and Science). This also comes from the need to increase our bottom quartile student learning outcomes and our subgroup performance.
Measurable Outcome:	In the areas of Reading, Math, and Science; our goal is to exceed our highest previous proficiency percentage as well as our highest gains percentage.
Monitoring:	Through analysis of iReady Diagnostics (Fall, Winter, Spring), Science Baseline, and midyear assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Derrick Mc Laughlin (derrick.mclaughlin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly high quality planning to include the Teacher Talent Developers. During planning, teachers will strategically utilize district resources to plan for high quality acceleration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale to support this decision is based on Hattie's research regarding effect size of both collective teacher efficacy (1.57) and acceleration of student learning .

Action Steps to Implement

- Teacher Talent Developers coaching and modeling planning and instruction in both Math and Reading.
- Dedicated time WEEKLY (non-negotiable) school-wide planning sessions using relevant/timely data to accelerate student learning.
- Student ownership of current progress monitoring data through conferencing and teacher coaching.

Person Responsible Derrick Mc Laughlin (derrick.mclaughlin@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase purposeful use of formative ELA data to provide differentiated support to individuals and small groups in order to increase students' ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: An increase in ELA proficiency (as measured on FSA) to at least 56%.

Monitoring: Classroom walkthrough data collection, and data brought to PLC group meetings weekly for planning purposes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sarah Leopold (sarah.leopold@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement a data analysis protocol to ensure opportunities for teachers and student ownership of the data. In addition, the data analysis protocol will ensure teachers make instructional decisions in planning based on both formal and informal data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Through coaching and modeling, teachers will become more comfortable with exploring and analyzing data, then planning purposeful ELA lessons to improve student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide support tools to teachers for differentiated small group instructional routines.
- TTDs coaching groups and individual teachers on how to analyze data and plan for specific student instruction.

Person Responsible Nelly Moreno (nelly.moreno@hcps.net)

Identify the bottom quartile students in third through fifth grade and develop a plan to track the identified students' progress in teacher data chats and group PLCs. Regularly share data with the school-based leadership team. Adjust support plans based on on-going data collection. Monitor student's progress through walkthroughs and analysis of student work.

Person Responsible Derrick Mc Laughlin (derrick.mclaughlin@hcps.net)

Conduct regular data chats with teachers in third through fifth grade utilizing the district's data analysis protocol. Invite all stakeholders to the data chats – ESE support, ELL support (to support ESSA subgroups). This data will include i-Ready, Pre-Requisite data, Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMAs), and student work samples.

Person Responsible Sarah Leopold (sarah.leopold@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus	Based on 2019 and 2021 data collected (as well as ongoing progress monitoring) our students who fall in the "Hispanic", "Economically Disadvantaged", "ELL", and "SWD" categories have statistically scored below 41% proficiency.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Each ESSA subgroup mentioned above will make a 10 percentage point (or more) increase as assessed on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Ongoing progress monitoring using iReady Diagnostics, Math Monthly Assessments, and district made Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMAs).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Derrick Mc Laughlin (derrick.mclaughlin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted learning groups of students who fall into multiple categories. Some students (ELL/Hispanic/FRL) will engage in "Imagine Learning" online language enhancement software with a strong focus on vocabulary. SWD will engage specifically in "BrainSpring Learning" with varying exceptionalities teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By focusing on smaller subgroups of students (and students who may fall into more than one category), growth will be targeted and much more purposeful.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement Imagine Learning for ELL/Hispanic students (100+ minutes weekly)

Person Responsible Sara Arzola (sara.arzola@hcps.net)

Implementation of BrainSpring Learning for SWD/FRL students (daily instruction)

Person Responsible Elizabeth Washington (elizabeth.washington@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Primary area of concern: Number of "bullying" incidents (from the Safe Schools for Alex site)
We have become a 7 Mindsets school this year. Our Social Emotional Team has daily and weekly lessons focused on students' interactions with peers and how to prevent and report bullying.

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.

Throughout the year, the Instructional Leadership Team, School Advisory Council, and PTA regularly meet to discuss both academic and cultural/environmental needs. Specifically the information gathered from the annual Insight survey and Panorama survey is collected, compared to previous years, and a plan of action is created to sustain our strongest areas of cultural/environmental components (respect and rapport, trust, professional autonomy). We have also planned on how to address our areas of growth (understanding of student conduct/needs, school cleanliness, and professional time on task).

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

Administration, ILT, SAC, and PTA work collaboratively with our social emotional team to ensure student success.

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
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00