

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Wilson Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Wilson Elementary School

702 W ENGLISH ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kayla Forcucci

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Wilson Elementary School

702 W ENGLISH ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">92%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">70%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

To guide each student to his or her greatest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Students For Life

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
Forcucci, Kayla	Principal	Curriculum and Data Leadership, monitor other school leaders, lead staff PD
Kim, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Data Leadership, monitor other school leaders responsibilities, lead staff PD
Burnside, Kristin	Reading Coach	Data PLC facilitator, Instructional coach, small group instructor, PD instructor
Jordan, Christine	Math Coach	Data PLC facilitator, Instructional coach, small group instructor, PD instructor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Kayla Forcucci

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Total number of students enrolled at the school

310

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.

8

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	50	49	55	45	47	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	10	11	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	13	0	0	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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	45	62	45	49	46	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	6	11	10	9	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	12	24	25	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in Math	25	33	16	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	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	0	4	13	2	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	45	62	45	49	46	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	6	11	10	9	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	12	24	25	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in Math	25	33	16	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	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	0	4	13	2	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				43%	52%	57%	54%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	55%	58%	67%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	50%	53%	67%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	54%	63%	56%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				41%	57%	62%	59%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	46%	51%	57%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	50%	53%	53%	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	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	57%	-21%	64%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
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 Fall/Winter/Spring

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	29	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	29	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	20	24	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	16	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	16	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	14
	English Language Learners	10	14	48

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	43	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	43	43
	Students With Disabilities	0	18	0
	English Language Learners	0	18	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	27	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	25	17
	English Language Learners	0	9	10

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	49	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	49	55
	Students With Disabilities	29	50	50
	English Language Learners	31	43	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	23	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	14	21	29
	English Language Learners	0	7	7

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	36	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	37	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	11	20	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	14	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	22
	English Language Learners	0	20	40
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	32	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	32	37
	Students With Disabilities	13	0	11
	English Language Learners	20	27	18
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	21	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	33
	English Language Learners	11	9	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	36		41
	Economically Disadvantaged	50		50
	Students With Disabilities	25		25
	English Language Learners	50		50

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12			16							
ELL	36	42		38	40		35				
HSP	38	38	31	39	29	20	33				
WHT	37	42		39	54		62				
FRL	38	40	40	41	35	8	39				
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	32	36		44	43						
ELL	42	35	36	40	38	42	39				
BLK	40			55							
HSP	36	41	35	39	38	35	45				
WHT	52	54		44	42		55				
FRL	39	41	33	39	40	35	39				
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	58	62		53	62						
ELL	47	62		42	62						
BLK	36			43							
HSP	49	64	65	51	61	53	42				
WHT	64	73		64	61		70				
FRL	48	65	67	54	59	57	48				

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	37
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
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	36
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?

In grade 3 all three teachers were new to the grade level and a third of students were e-Learning. Only eleven students in third grade scored proficient. In grade 4 and 5, students who had scored proficient in prior years were more likely to make a gain. Across all grade levels we see that Bottom Quartile students made minimal gain. ESE students made fewer gains. Gains , in general, was a struggle.

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

- Math Bottom Quartile
- Gains for ELA and Math
- Proficiency for ELA and Math
- Science

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

Contributing factors: eLearning, COVID quarantines, teachers new to the grade level, vacant 5th grade position. New actions take: the 4th grade team has remained in tact. All are returning to Wilson. Half of 5th grade has returned. One teacher is new to the grade level and content support is needed. Grade 3 has all new teachers to the grade level. Content support is needed as well as team building for the grade level. A closer monitoring of student data, by both teacher and student, is needed to make more timely instructional adjustments.

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

Grade 4 showed a 5% gain in math proficiency from the year prior. All other areas are areas for improvement.

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

The 4th grade team worked closely with each other to plan and with instructional coaches. They provided after school tutoring and student incentives.

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

A deep dive of student data and plan for student need, frequent checks for student learning and adjustment in instruction.

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.

Professional development opportunities offered will be: instructional coaching and Making Learning Visible PD/Book Study.

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

Grade level planning
Coaching
IMPACT/ Instructional Walks with feedback and action plans

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During this past year we experienced a change in instructional practice, disruption to learning (COVID quarantines), and introduction of eLearning platform for learning. Instructional practice, although centered around Florida Standards, lost it's focus at times, the urgency and momentum, and consistency to support all students once returned from quarantine. Students often could communicate an understanding of the standard verbally but task performance and assessments did not.

Measurable Outcome: By the Spring of 2022, students will demonstrate 45% (ELA and Math) and 47% (Science) proficiency on the 2022 Spring FSA.

Monitoring: ELA progress monitoring: iReady diagnostics, Monthly assessments
 Math progress monitoring: iReady diagnostics, Math Monthlies
 Science progress monitoring: quarterly assessments
 In addition, informal formative assessments will be used on a daily/weekly basis. Teachers will plan "checks for understanding" to make lesson adjustments and plan for small groups (reteach, accelerate, enrich)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: *Daily implementation of independent thinking routines will be used in lessons across content.
 *Grade level teams will plan with Instructional Coaches to support content knowledge and development of questions, tasks, and assessments that yield data that allow the teacher to assess student progress toward learning outcomes and provide for lesson adjustment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Visible Thinking is about teaching students "thinking routines" to improve thinking and comprehension abilities. By making thinking visible students can discuss and reflect on their own thinking, as well as, the thinking of their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

Present priorities and independent thinking routines to staff.

Person Responsible Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

Plan with coaches to strengthen content knowledge and select thinking routines.

Person Responsible Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Weekly look-for thinking routines in classroom lessons. Provide feedback on implementation of strategies and results visible.

Person Responsible Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: SWD fell below the Federal Index of 41%. Students have experienced changes in ESE staff 2 years in a row.

Measurable Outcome: By the Spring of 2022, students in the SWD subgroup will have an overall Federal Index over 41%

Monitoring: ELA Progress monitor through iReady diagnostics, monthly assessments
 Math Progress monitor through iReady diagnostics, math monthlies
 Science progress monitoring: quarterly assessments
 Quarterly IEP reviews with VE and Gen Ed teachers
 VE teachers attend planning sessions with grade levels served
 In addition, informal formative assessments will be used on a daily/weekly basis.
 Teachers will plan "checks for understanding" to make lesson adjustments and plan for small groups (reteach, accelerate, enrich)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: *Daily implementation of independent thinking routines will be used in lessons across content.
 *Grade level teams will plan with instructional coaches to support content knowledge and development of questions, tasks, and assessments that yield data that allow the teacher to assess student progress toward learning outcomes and provide for lesson adjustment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Visible Thinking is about teaching students "thinking routines" to improve thinking and comprehension abilities. By making thinking visible, students can discuss and reflect on their own thinking as well as the thinking of their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly look-for thinking routines in classroom lessons. Provide feedback on implementation of strategies and results visible.

Person Responsible Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

Plan with coaches to strengthen content knowledge and select thinking routines.

Person Responsible Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Meet quarterly with leadership to review student progress toward gains and proficiency.

Person Responsible Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 37% in grade 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to instructional vacancies, COVID quarantines, and fragmented e-Learning. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include purposeful questions, tasks, and assessments aligned to standards to yield evidence of student learning and explicit modeling of reading strategies to support reading behaviors. This will result in an improvement in student proficiency on 2022 ELA FSA.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of grade 3-5 students scoring at 50th percentile on I-Ready assessment will increase to 50% as measured by I-Ready End-of-Year diagnostic.

Monitoring: Observation of instruction and feedback to instructional staff

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Team planning: Grade level teams will plan ELA with Reading Coach or Admin to look specifically at the standard and determine a strategy that will best support student learning. Explicit modeling: When teachers explicitly model the strategy and produce an exemplar, students then know what is expected and will be able to meet expectations. Implementing purposeful questions, tasks, and assessments aligned to standards: When these components fully align with the rigor of the standard then students are given the opportunity to perform grade level work and student achievement will more like reflect proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In 2021, the data showed students struggled to be proficient with grade level text.. The improvement strategy of team planning, explicit modeling, and implementing purposeful questions, tasks, and assessments aligned to standards to yield evidence of student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Meet with School Site Coach to conduct a “planning for planning” session using the backwards design model. During this session, the District Resource Teacher and Site Coach will plan a lesson with the end in mind while creating questions to support teachers in having a clear understanding of the questions, tasks, and assessments.

Person Responsible: Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Collaborate with Teachers during weekly planning sessions to focus on the following components of the backwards planning model: Creating and/or analyzing the mini assessment; creating standards-based tasks to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate learning; and craft purposeful questions to encourage student discourse around the content while applying the strategy to meet the demands of the standards.

Person Responsible: Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Identify teachers to engage in job-embedded co-teaching professional development utilizing the lesson study model.

Person Responsible Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

Embed professional development around modeling of reading strategies to support reading behaviors during current collaborative planning sessions each week.

Person Responsible Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@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.

We will continue to implement our Wildcats of Honor character education program and 3 R's. Through positive reinforcement of the 15 Essentials of the 3Rs we will reduce the number of high risk interactions (only 4 reported on the 19/20 school year)

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.

Wilson's Wildcats of Honor program is based in Citizenship and Patriotism. Our character development plan is established through a house system based on 4 character traits: Courage, Integrity, Commitment, and Giving. We have "The Essential 15" actions which support our 3R's. Teacher use these Essentials in their classroom and throughout the school so expectations are clear and consistent across the campus. Students are rewarded for displaying the Essentials/3 Rs and encouraged to buildup each other when they see them following them. These school-wide essentials are visible to all students, parents, visitors, and volunteers.

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

All staff are involved in modeling, promoting, and reinforcing the Essentials. They award daily points for students seen demonstrating behaviors. Monthly recognition for the lead house is done during the cafeteria

lunch time. Business partners contribute to the treats given for the monthly awards and contribute to suggestions during the SAC.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00