Washington Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Washington Elementary School

1407 ESTELLE ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Monica Barber

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Washington Elementary School

1407 ESTELLE ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

To provide an equitable education and safe environment that supports and empowers our students, families, and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Building our CommUNITY

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barber, Monica	Principal	Instructional Leader
Brascom, Satonya	Assistant Principal	Supports the vision of the principal and serves as an instructional leader.
King, Jesenia	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/29/2022, Monica Barber

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
24

Total number of students enrolled at the school
352

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	26	51	54	56	44	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	9	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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 7/29/2022

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	46	59	47	50	43	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	303
Attendance below 90 percent	1	31	16	22	16	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	13	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	13	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

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

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	8	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	46	59	47	50	43	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	303
Attendance below 90 percent	1	31	16	22	16	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	13	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	13	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

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

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	8	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	27%	53%	56%				24%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						35%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						44%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	50%	50%				35%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	71%						54%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						62%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	21%	59%	59%				35%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	21%	52%	-31%	58%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	17%	55%	-38%	58%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	20%	54%	-34%	62%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	31%	57%	-26%	64%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	30%	51%	-21%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	32	52		43	52		31				
ELL	18	50	57	53	76		11				
BLK	28	42		47	66		26				
HSP	22	56	60	53	75	62	13				
FRL	29	46	38	49	67	56	20				

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	26	40		29	33		20				
ELL	29	50		34	70						
BLK	28	56		33	56		15				
HSP	28	53		30	47		15				
FRL	30	55		33	52		15				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	27	36	50	39	73						
ELL	10	38		27	54						
BLK	26	33	39	37	52	42	32				
HSP	16	42	50	30	58	82	43				
FRL	23	36	44	34	54	62	35				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The amount of ELL and Black students who are proficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our 5th grade reading Achievement Points had the lowest performance.

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

The amount of students who are reading with proficiency through implementations of consistent instructional strategies beginning in Kindergarten.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our ELA learning gains improved the most with our 4th graders.

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

We had an emphasis on small group professional development and we were able to hire highly effective teachers.

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

In order to facilitate acceleration we will provide ongoing feedback on academic ownership for the our students to acquire grade level standards and data driven conversations.

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.

We will provide differentiating professional development, follow-up on professional development, provide trainings to paraprofessionals to be dual useful as well as allocating more time to planning.

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

We will create procedures to conduct fidelity checks, create surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of our professional development, and monitor student progress towards grade level standards.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Teachers focused on students' well-being needs (electricity/food/water) and provided standard review sessions (worksheets of previously taught materials) due to shortage of computers and internet; which lacked teacher created questions on new grade-level appropriate content and led to teacher-led discourses instead of student-led.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	100% of teachers will participate in discussions and coaching cycles targeted to increase student discourse within the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of coaching, remediation groups, and acceleration groups. Administration will attend monthly Professional Learning Communities to discuss students' learning gains from implementation of the strategies. Administration will review evaluation data to measure effectiveness of strategy implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Barber (monica.barber@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Accountable Talk Professional Development Observe Me Professional Development Collaborative Planning Sessions Five Practice for Orchestrating Productive Mathematics Discussion Teacher-Coach Analysis of scripted lessons
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Student discussion leads to deeper understanding and learning.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Hire a Reading Coach. The Reading Coach will focus on coaching, side-by-side coaching, modeling, and lesson planning focused on planning effective questions that address grade-level questions with teachers in grades k-5. The coaching and modeling will occur weekly under the supervision of the school principal. The side-by-side coaching will occur once a month under the supervision of the principal. The Reading Coach will meet weekly with teachers in grades K-5 to plan effective lessons to meet the needs of students in grades K-5. The Reading Coach will meet with teachers once a month to discuss student work towards meeting the targeted grade level appropriate standard. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of coaching.

Person Responsible	Satonya Brascom (satonya.brascom@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Hire a Math Resource. The Math Resource will focus on coaching, side-by-side coaching, modeling, and lesson planning effective questions that address grade-level questions with teachers in grades k-5. The coaching and modeling will occur weekly under the supervision of the school principal. The side-by-side coaching will occur once a month under the supervision of the principal. The Math Resource will meet weekly with teachers in grades K-5 to plan effective lessons to mee the needs of students in grades K-5. The Math Resource will meet with teachers once a month to discuss student work towards meeting the targeted grade level appropriate standard. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of coaching.

Person Responsible   Satonya Brascom (satonya.brascom@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Hire a Reading Resource. The Reading Resource will focus on pulling small groups of students in grades 3-5 that fall in our Black and ELL ESSA categories for extra remediation or passed third grade via Portfolio using Scholastic Edge, LLI, Reflex Math, and/or Reading Blast-Off. The remediation instruction will focus on all content areas and progress monitoring. The Reading Resource will assist the Reading Coach with modeling and side-by-side coaching with teachers in grades 3-5. The modeling will occur weekly under the supervision of the school principal. The side-by-side coaching will occur once a month under the supervision of the principal. The Reading Resource will meet with teachers once a month to discuss student work towards meeting the targeted grade level appropriate standard. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of remediation small groups.

Person Responsible   Satonya Brascom (satonya.brascom@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Hire a paraprofessional. The paraprofessional will focus on pulling small groups of students (K-5) that have been identified as one or more years behind in reading or math using Scholastic Edge, LLI, Reading Blast-Off, and/or Reflex Math. The instruction will focus on remediation in all content areas and progress monitoring. The instructional will occur weekly under the supervision of the school principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of remediation small groups.

Person Responsible   Satonya Brascom (satonya.brascom@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will participate in a job embedded professional development monthly entitled, "Observe Me". Teachers will provide feedback to their colleagues based on targeted strategies. All debriefs will be held immediately after school. Teachers will participate in a follow-up observation approximately one month later. Administration will do walkthroughs to ensure strategies are used effectively. Administration will send monthly surveys to teachers asking for feedback in regard to effectiveness and next steps. Also, administration will review evaluation data to measure effectiveness of strategy implementation.

Person Responsible   Monica Barber (monica.barber@hcps.net)

Teachers will participate in a book study using the text "Unlocking English Language Learners". Teachers will identify a few strategies from the text and use the strategies to develop our preplanning activities to improve our multilingual learning instructional practices. Administration will attend and teacher leaders will lead the professional development throughout the school year. Administration will do walkthroughs to ensure strategies are used effectively. Administration will attend monthly Professional Learning Communities to discuss students' learning gains from implementation of the strategies.

Person Responsible   Monica Barber (monica.barber@hcps.net)

Teachers will participate in a book study using the text "Number, Sense Routines". Teachers will identify a few strategies from the text and use the strategies to develop our preplanning activities to increase instructional strategies with student discourse. Administration will attend and our leadership team will lead the professional development throughout the school year. Administration will do walkthroughs to ensure strategies are used effectively. Administration will attend monthly Professional Learning Communities to discuss students' learning gains from implementation of the strategies

Person Responsible   Monica Barber (monica.barber@hcps.net)

Teachers will participate in a job embedded professional development during pre-planning to build their writing instructional practices. Administration will attend and our leadership team will develop the

professional development during the summer and lead the professional development throughout the school year.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our Black Students were below the ESSA subgroup norm of 41%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will identify our Black Students and provide them with additional small group instruction to support their learning and raise our ESSA goal to above the 41% norm.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration will conduct walkthroughs to ensure our small group instruction is taking place.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will use evidence-based instructional practices to provide additional support with comprehension of grade appropriate standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Our students thrive from effective instructional strategies provided by teachers on a consistent basis.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students will deepen their understanding of reading strategies through productive dialogue in small groups using high quality instruction aligned to standards.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students will deepen their understanding of reading strategies through productive dialogue in small groups using high quality instruction aligned to standards.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of our students will score proficient on our FASST assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of our students will score proficient on our FASST assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Administration will conduct walkthroughs to ensure our students are grasping the strategies being presented during small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Barber, Monica, monica.barber@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

  ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Our evidence-based practices align with our district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and ELA Standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

  ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Yes, our evidence-based practices address the need of all our students in the subject area of reading.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

  ◦ Literacy Leadership

  ◦ Literacy Coaching

  ◦ Assessment

  ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
We will incorporate Literacy Coaching and Professional Learning on a weekly basis to support the pedagogy knowledge of our instructional staff.	Brascom, Satonya, satonya.brascom@sdhc.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

50% of our caregivers will attend events or provide designed to center their voices. 90% of caregiver conferences will empower the caregiver as the individual who knows their child the most and will shift the balance of power to the caregiver. 100% of the teachers will teach using strategies that empower students and make space for them to direct the curriculum and learning experiences.

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

Administration: Monica Barber & Satonya Brascom
SEL Lead Team: Sharon Bennett, Sarah Wooten, Yuri Mota Rodriguez, & Kelly Von Euw