

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Woodbridge Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Woodbridge Elementary School

8301 WOODBRIDGE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ana "Victoria" Morse

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 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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Woodbridge Elementary School

8301 WOODBRIDGE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[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	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

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.

Show our Wildcat PRIDE by:

P- Be a Problem Solver

R- Take Responsibility for my actions

I- Invest care in myself and others.

D- Show Determination to reach my goals.

E- Give my best Effort.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building a Foundation for the Future.

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
Morse, Victoria	Principal	<p>The leadership team includes, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal • Assistant Principal • School Counselor • School Psychologist • School Social Worker • Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, Science) • ESE teacher • PLC Liaisons for each grade level, K-5 • SAC Chair • ELP Coordinator • ELL Resource • Attendance Committee Representative • Behavior team Representative/Behavior Specialist/Coach <p>(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose of the meeting)</p> <p>PSLT Coordinator—Principal/Assistant Principal: Coordinate and oversee the decision making process to ensure integrity and consistency of the PS/Rtl implementation at the building level. The principal should attend PSLT meetings at the Tier 1 level, provide specific procedures for resource allocation, and monitor the fidelity of instruction/intervention at the school-wide and classroom levels (Tier 1)</p> <p>PSLT Meeting Facilitator— e.g., School Psychologist, Reading Resource, School Social Worker, School Counselor, and ESE Specialist: The facilitator opens the meeting with a brief description of what the team expects to accomplish during the meeting. The facilitator is to establish and maintain a supportive atmosphere throughout the meeting by encouraging participation from team members, clarifying and summarizing information communicated during the meeting, design specific procedures for ongoing communication between school staff and PSLT, and assist with monitoring the fidelity of intervention implementation across each tier.</p> <p>PSLT Content Specialist— e.g., Administrator, Reading Resource, Math Coach, Science Resource, or ESE Specialist: Ensures that when new content curricular materials are obtained, implementers are adequately trained to use the materials, check fidelity of use of curricular materials and strategies, determine what elements need to be included in an effective core instructional program and assist the team in identifying which instructional strategies are most effective to address areas of concerns. The Content Specialist may also assist with monitoring the fidelity of instruction and intervention implementation across each tier.</p> <p>PSLT Data Consultant— e.g., Assistant Principal, Reading Resource, Math Coach, Science Resource, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, ESE Specialist, and/ or School Counselor</p> <p>Counselor: Prior to the meeting, the Data Consultant assists team members with collecting, organizing, analyzing, graphing and</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>interpreting data. The data should be presented in easily understandable visual displays to guide the decision making process.</p> <p>PSLT Timekeeper—Ensures that meeting times are respected and helps the team stay focused on the respective agenda. Because many decisions need to be made during the meeting, the timekeeper should redirect the team's discussion when necessary. The timekeeper should know who are working on specific projects and set timelines for completion/implementation as well as monitor the fidelity across each tier.</p> <p>PSLT Recorder—Records the plans of the team, including meeting minutes/notes. This person will capture all important information, especially related to instruction/ intervention specifics, progress monitoring, data analysis, and future meeting dates. The recorder may need to ask for clarification several times during the meeting to ensure that enough detail is recorded so that a person who did not attend the meeting would be able to clearly understand the nature and implementation of the instructional/intervention plan</p> <p>The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.</p>
Toscani, Michele	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instructional needs, New Teacher TIP program, textbooks, testing, calendar items, grades, report cards, student placement, field trips, etc
Scalzi, Diane	SAC Member	Works collaboratively with the Principal and HCTA representative to organize and facilitate voting and meetings. SAC Chair works closely with stakeholders to provide meeting dates and times, agendas, and progress monitors the SIP.
Reinhart, Jackie	Math Coach	Coaching and implementation of effective math strategies, manages math resource room, works with small groups.
Chacon, Claudia	ELL Compliance Specialist	English Speakers of Other Languages, language barrier needs, Access testing.
Hunter, Lisa	Reading Coach	Coaching and implementation of effective reading strategies, manages reading book/resource room, works with small groups.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Ana "Victoria" Morse

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.*

2

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

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

586

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.

6

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	82	90	102	110	91	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	577
Attendance below 90 percent	37	29	43	37	35	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	26	30	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

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	80	99	98	86	91	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	24	17	14	20	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	80	99	98	86	91	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549	
Attendance below 90 percent	24	17	14	20	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	

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	
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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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				47%	52%	57%	49%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	55%	58%	56%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	50%	53%	52%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				49%	54%	63%	51%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	57%	62%	49%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	46%	51%	34%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	50%	53%	61%	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	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	51%	-15%	53%	-17%
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 Reading and Math
Science Formative Tests

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	31%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	30%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	15%	26%	35%
	English Language Learners	6%	13%	19%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	29%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	30%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	20%	4%
	English Language Learners	5%	13%	16%
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	41%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	40%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	31%	28%
	English Language Learners	21%	27%	31%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	26%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	25%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	30%	36%
	English Language Learners	9%	4%	22%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	61%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	60%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	34%	49%	40%
	English Language Learners	33%	52%	54%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	25%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	24%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	13%	21%
	English Language Learners	3%	8%	18%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	53%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	53%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	49%	41%	49%
	English Language Learners	35%	37%	45%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17%	30%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	31%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	25%	51%
	English Language Learners	11%	13%	44%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49%	53%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	53%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	49%	41%	49%
	English Language Learners	35%	37%	45%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	30%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	31%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	25%	51%
	English Language Learners	11%	13%	44%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44.3%	54.8%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	59.4%	
	Students With Disabilities	35.7%	43.2%	
	English Language Learners	32.8%	48.3%	

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	19	22	18	22	44		33				
ELL	42	69	62	38	33		39				
BLK	40			35							
HSP	40	60	53	38	26	25	39				
MUL	35			22							
WHT	44			50							
FRL	41	59	52	39	31	35	37				
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	36	48	29	41	53	38	40				
ELL	36	48	40	38	44	27	7				
BLK	47	50		37	50						

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
HSP	44	54	43	47	50	27	37				
MUL	64			82							
WHT	52	56		52	58						
FRL	47	54	42	49	52	30	44				
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	28	47	58	34	36	20	35				
ELL	32	45	56	46	34	31	56				
BLK	42	53		39	56						
HSP	47	56	59	53	48	33	63				
MUL	36			45							
WHT	71	67		26	45						
FRL	49	57	53	50	49	35	59				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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?

Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension is low across all grade levels, with Math and Science learning gains the lowest proficiency.

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

Math was the lowest proficiency at 39% proficiency with only 33% of students demonstrating learning gains..

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

ELL proficiency was the lowest across all grade levels. Need for professional development in scaffolding strategies for English Language Learners in Math Best Practices. Grade level collaborative planning using the standards and curriculum guides.

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

ELA Grade 3 showed overall gains and BQ showed gains.

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

ELP before school and during lunch. Instructional coaches impacted this gain.

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

Small group focus with fidelity checks by leadership team. ILT will meet once a month to discuss trends and establish action steps to accelerate learning. Consistent collaboration among the general education teacher and the ELL Resource teacher.

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.

Mini- PD on planning, skilled based small group lessons, and scaffolding strategies to support ELL students. Resource teachers will help facilitate. Build teacher capacity to increase their ownership through Teach Me Tuesdays.

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

Documentation of progress towards individual goals will be discussed, and data will be used to drive discussions. Adjustments may be needed based on the data. Make it Monday to assist teachers with creation of visuals and charts to support students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus	Standards based planning with differentiation and ongoing assessment for learning will provide data to teachers to inform instruction and make adjustments to meet the needs of students.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Students will increase their proficiency in all areas by with at least 5% gains in all subjects.
Monitoring:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lesson objectives will be standards based with measurable learning targets to monitor student progress. 2. Targeted walkthroughs with specific look-fors by Leadership Team will provide data and feedback to progress monitor effectiveness small group instruction. 3. Feedback will be provided to grade level teams and teachers. 4. Ongoing data collection will be analyzed weekly to determine if adjustments are needed to be made
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Victoria Morse (victoria.morse@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Math: Utilize the monthly math assessments and data chat model to determine next steps and drive instructional planning and planning for small groups.</p> <p>Science: Utilize progress monitoring assessments to inform instruction.</p> <p>Reading: Utilize research based practices and scaffolding strategies to support ELL students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Allows for ongoing progress monitoring and standards based lesson planning. Students can track and monitor their progress and set goals during data chats with teachers.</p> <p>Coaching and planning support with content experts ensures high quality instruction best practices are being implemented to impact learning.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly Collaborative planning sessions utilizing standards based planning tools and resources.
- 2.. Ongoing progress monitoring of ELL students using Imagine Learning and iReady Growth Monitoring Checks.
3. Small group fidelity checks to look for evidence of intentional small group planning using scaffolding strategies.
4. Evidence of student taking ownership of their learning.

Person Responsible Victoria Morse (victoria.morse@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 FSA ELA scores, 41% of students scored in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include scaffolding strategies to support ELL students and differentiation resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on FSA ELA.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of grades 3-5 students scoring at (a) Level 3 on the Spring ELA assessment will increase to 51% as measured by FSA.

Monitoring: Ongoing progress monitoring and data analysis by grade level teams will provide feedback and inform instructional decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Victoria Morse (victoria.morse@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will plan for differentiation and scaffolding to support their diverse learners with grade-level content and acceleration of unfinished learning (Instructional Frameworks).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In 2021, the data showed ELL students scored the lowest on FSA ELA. The improvement strategy of scaffolding and differentiation will increase student proficiency, resulting in improved student performance in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

- Teachers will attend common planning sessions by grade level/content area every week. Planning will be data driven and include the development of small groups based on data. In the teacher-led small groups, teachers will plan for the use of pre-identified literacy scaffolds to accelerate identified unfinished learning.
- During planning, ELA and ESOL teachers will identify at least one scaffold/strategy for English Language Learners (ELLs) and embed it in their daily lessons. The following strategies have been recommended by the coaches and ESOL Resource Teacher (DRT): ELlevation strategies, sentence stems for speaking and writing, anchor charts with visuals, and vocabulary development strategies such as content glossaries and word maps.
- Teachers will plan for and implement select literacy scaffolds in all classes and content areas. The four school-wide literacy scaffolds include think marks, activating prior knowledge, collaborative conversations, and building background knowledge. These will be modeled and monitored by the literacy team.

Person Responsible Lisa Hunter (lisa.hunter@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.

Teachers will utilize the MTSS process to progress monitor Tier 2 and 3 students with behavioral interventions. Behavior Tracker monitor trends among students to provide feedback to teachers.

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.

Character building lessons, Restorative Practices, and the development of a mentor program will help children develop internal understanding, self-control, and a desire to follow the rules.

1. Teachers will participate in a book study: Better Than Carrots or Sticks: Restorative Practices for Positive Classroom Management.
2. Ongoing Grade level PLC Collaborative Planning to create Restorative Practices lessons/ Social Studies lessons
3. Students will demonstrate their ownership in their behavior and earn Pride Dollars for positive behavior.
4. Monthly Positive Behavior Rewards for students.

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

The School Compact and Schoolwide Behavior Plan supports proactive positive strategies that all stakeholders play a role in at the school. Ongoing communication through the use of Parentlink, monthly newsletters, SAC Meetings, and PTA Meetings, will enhance parent communication and school culture. Parent and Staff surveys provided feedback to Administration to implement changes for parents to be more engaged in their child's learning. Based on a staff survey administered during the summer, as well as the Insight Survey, a new Schoolwide Behavior Plan and revised committees were created, gaining buy-in from stakeholders.

Part V: Budget

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

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