

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Yates 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Yates Elementary School

301 KINGSWAY RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Varnum

Start Date for this Principal: 4/8/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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	22

Yates Elementary School

301 KINGSWAY RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[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;">80%</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;">75%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
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.

Encourage, Empower and Elevate Eaglets for tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life. Our vision is for all staff and students to work together as a community to ensure success both academically as well as socially.

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
Varnum, Lisa	Principal	As principal, Ms. Varnum oversees the day to day operations of the school and ensures procedures are in place to create a safe and optimal learning environment for all. She also provides support through professional development, walk through feedback and side by side coaching to support teachers in their journey to provide quality instructional for all students.
Delgado, Tim	Assistant Principal	As assistant principal, Mr. Delgado assist the principal with the day to day operations of the school and ensures procedures are in place to create a safe and optimal learning environment for all. He also provides support through walk through feedback and side by side coaching to support teachers in their journey to provide quality instruction for all students.
Taylor, Ashlee	Math Coach	As our on site math coach, Ms. Taylor supports the vision of the school by providing planning support, side by side coaching, professional development and data chats with teachers. She also serves a vital role on the leadership team through data analysis of trends and areas of needs as she focuses her supports where the needs arise.
Thomas, Katie	Parent Engagement Liaison	As our parent engagement liaison and SAC chair, Ms. Thomas supports the needs of our school community through resources, activities and routine communications on how our parents, faculty and community at large can work together to support student success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/8/2019, Lisa Varnum

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

594

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.

5

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	100	96	97	101	93	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
Attendance below 90 percent	44	43	36	36	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	36	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	44	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
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	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	6	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 12/12/2021

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	93	96	103	98	93	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	22	30	30	25	29	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	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	1	6	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	93	96	103	98	93	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	22	30	30	25	29	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	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	1	6	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				43%	52%	57%	41%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	55%	58%	43%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	50%	53%	32%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	54%	63%	43%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	57%	62%	47%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	46%	51%	38%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	50%	53%	46%	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	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	55%	-10%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	62%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	53%	-12%
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 assessments were administered in the Fall, Winter and Spring. Additionally, 5th grade students participated in a district created science baseline and midyear assessment.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	38	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	42	57
	Students With Disabilities	67	43	50
	English Language Learners	20	18	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	25	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	30	48
	Students With Disabilities	33	43	33
	English Language Learners	13	12	36

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	31	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	43	56
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	20
	English Language Learners	19	29	47
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	14	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	21	46
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	13
	English Language Learners	4	8	30

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	55	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	62	74
	Students With Disabilities	40	50	50
	English Language Learners	7	7	38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	29	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	29	47
	Students With Disabilities	20	40	36
	English Language Learners	0	7	38

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	28	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	53	57
	Students With Disabilities	22	21	35
	English Language Learners	29	7	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	20	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	26	46
	Students With Disabilities	20	24	34
	English Language Learners	0	7	27

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	19	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	51	57
	Students With Disabilities	17	24	28
	English Language Learners	0	0	8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	16	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	14	29
	Students With Disabilities	14	20	32
	English Language Learners	8	0	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	32.4	30.8	
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	29	
	Students With Disabilities	35.5	32.2	
	English Language Learners	11.6	7.02	

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	33			17	35		26				
ELL	26			33	50		11				
BLK	45			35	50		27				
HSP	37			35	35		18				
MUL				23							
WHT	64			53	47		41				
FRL	43			35	39	38	23				
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	61	75	27	68	73	42				
ELL	17	39	46	27	60	53	7				
BLK	33	43	33	33	57	69	36				

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	34	55	59	41	60	64	35				
MUL	29			29							
WHT	62	59	73	54	66	58	63				
FRL	40	48	49	42	58	58	42				
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	24	24	7	29	35	28	33				
ELL	24	40	46	33	47	43	33				
BLK	34	43	38	27	41	38	22				
HSP	36	42	32	44	49	48	45				
MUL	43	36		57	55						
WHT	50	42	17	46	43	17	48				
FRL	39	39	30	41	46	37	40				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	238
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96%
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	34
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	
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	39
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	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	23
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	51
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	38
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?

"All students" made steady growth all areas K-3rd grade.

In the area of math, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th grade ESE students did not demonstrate growth at the same rate as all students or ELL.

Intermediate ELL students performed significantly below their peers in the area of ELA.

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

2019 FSA: The lowest performing cell on the 2019 FSA was ELA achievement at 43% proficiency. Based on 20-21 iReady progress monitoring, 4th and 5th grade all students were below this % by 10 or more points.

Based on district math monthly assessments, Yates remained below the district average in grades 2-5 on all assessments.

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

While many students met their typical growth on iReady, the gaps present in our 4th and 5th grade are so significant that students are still below proficiency. This is especially evident with our ESE students.

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

20-21 iReady: K-3rd ELA showed significant improvement. 3rd grade 2021 FSA Reading: % of students earning a level 1 decreased by 18%. The % of 3rd grade students demonstrating proficiency increased by 12 points as compared to 2019.

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

Targeted focus was on the individual student progress with strong supports as needed.

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

Consistent use of computer based and face to face instruction with a strong focus on teachers ability to assess within the lesson and make adjustments in response to the students.

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.

Planning to support deep understanding of the standards as well as pre-requisite skills.
Engagement strategies to promote true discussion.
Side by side coaching around intentional in the moment, instructional moves.

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

Through planning and side by side coaching, we will be building the capacity of the teachers within our school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improve core and small group instruction through routine data analysis, planning/ implementation of discussion structures to increase student engagement, and assessments during the lesson with planned adjustments to the instruction. An intentional focus will be on our multiracial and ESE subgroups.
 Formal, informal and walk through data reveals that teachers are doing the majority of the heavy lifting (doing most of the talking or jumping in to direct or guide) rather than allowing students to explore their thinking with one another.

Measurable Outcome: 4% or more growth will be seen in all areas (proficiency, gain, and BQ) on the ELA and math district or state FSA assessments by May 2022.

Monitoring: Routine data reviews will be conducted after all formative assessments to track progress and adjust teacher and student supports as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: On site, side by side coaching supports to meet the need for job embedded professional development to build teacher capacity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Significant gains were noted within intentional progress monitoring, planning, and adjustments for specific grades. The implementation of these strategies will all students will positively increase student achievement across content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly time for data review and planning supported by the academic coaches and administration.

Person Responsible: Ashlee Taylor (ashlee.taylor@hcps.net)

Grade level data chats after formative assessments to determine grade and class level trends and develop next steps. Data chats will also be used to progress monitor individual students to determine needed interventions or enrichment opportunities.

Person Responsible: Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

In class coaching and feedback to support teachers with intentional instructional moves in response to students grasp of the leaving.

Person Responsible: Ashlee Taylor (ashlee.taylor@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: While ELA scores are not available for 4th and 5th grade, iReady data and observations reveals a need to increase proficiency in ELA. Based on prior learning gaps, a clear plan for strategic learning acceleration is needed to bridge students to on grade level performance.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students scoring proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment will increase by 5 percentage points.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring in 3rd - 5th grade ELA will be through end of unit district progress monitoring assessments as well as iReady diagnostic assessments in the Fall, Winter in Spring. This data will be used for individual goal setting and well as planning for future instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement a planning structure with ELA teams in grades 3-5 that will allow them to internalize the Guiding Question and use it as a basis for backwards planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Walk through data suggest that teachers are focused on standards in isolation rather than building engaged readers.

Action Steps to Implement

*Fishbowl with Reading coach as the model utilizing teacher think partners during both instructional and planning to help build teacher capacity across the school.

Person Responsible Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

*Implement coaching cycles around teacher clarity of the guiding question and its relationship to the daily learning targets.

Person Responsible Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

*Conduct focused walk through in grades 3-5 providing feedback to teachers on the learning targets/task guiding questions alignment.

Person Responsible Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@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.

Based on the SafeSchools for Alex.org site, 19-20 data in the area of Violent Incidents was .87 per 100 students. The number of students involved were minimal with most of the incidents were with our Behavioral Support Units. Ongoing mental health and counseling supports are provided on a weekly basis.

In the area of social emotional, the Panorama survey data was collected for 20-21. Emotional Regulation was the lowest domain with only 40% of students responding favorably. Two lowest questions are as follows: :

When you get upset, how often are you able to calm yourself? 40% responded favorability

When things go wrong, how often can you get yourself to relax? 34% responded favorability

****supporting students with strategies to regulate and de-escalate as needed is an area of focus.**

Additionally data shows attendance and tardies are still an area of focus.

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.

Ongoing feedback is solicited throughout the year from various groups around many aspects that impact our way of work. Monthly sessions are held with strategic groups of teachers to analysis systems and structures with recommended adjustments solicited. Our new teachers also meet monthly to collaborate around successes and challenges to ensure a successful onboarding experience.

Survey data is collected from parents with positive results from those participating. **The % of Spanish surveys returned is not proportionate to the % of Spanish families in our school. Efforts to connect with our ELL parents is an area of focus.

Our School Advisor Counsel and Parent Teacher Association meets regularly to maintain open dialog between the school and community at large. Our school has created new partnerships to increase relationships with community stakeholders as we work towards a common mission of supporting all students.

Very positive feedback was received from those in attendance at our Spring community resources zoom however attendance was still low. An area of focus for 21-22 is to increase marketing and incentives to increase participation. It is also hopeful that the ability to have evening events on campus this year will also increase parental involvement and an overall positive culture.

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

Parent and Family Engagement Coordinator, Katie Thomas, along with our administration and SAC Committee works with students services, teachers, administration and parent surveys to identify areas of interest with families. Based on this information, meetings in person or zoom are provided to provide information or resources to support our families.

Providing students, staff and parents an opportunity to be heard and valued is the strongest leverage to maintaining and improving our positive culture. This is the vision of the leadership team, staff and PTA.

Part V: Budget

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

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