Bellamy Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bellamy Elementary School

9720 WILSKY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michele Toscani

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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

Bellamy Elementary School

9720 WILSKY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[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 KG-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	92%

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.

Bellamy Elementary builds Leaders with HEART (Honesty, Effort, Achievement, Respect, Teamwork).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bellamy Elementary will be among the top achieving schools in the district.

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
Toscani, Michele	Principal	Instructional Leader, engaging stakeholders, and collaborating with others to meet the needs of all students.
Santelices, Julie	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, engaging stakeholders, and collaborating with others to meet the needs of all students.
Dominguez, JohnMichael	Instructional Coach	Math Coach Instructional Leader, engaging stakeholders, and collaborating with others to meet the needs of all students.
Hubbard, sophia	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach Instructional Leader, engaging stakeholders, and collaborating with others to meet the needs of all students.
Huntley, Camille	Instructional Coach	ELL Resource Teacher Instructional Leader, engaging stakeholders, and collaborating with others to meet the needs of all students.
Roane, Angie	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coach Instructional Leader, engaging stakeholders, and collaborating with others to meet the needs of all students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/27/2022, Michele Toscani

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.*

2

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

544

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

4

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

4

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	82	70	74	99	94	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	507
Attendance below 90 percent	1	24	14	23	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	68	72	95	92	91	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	20	18	20	15	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	20	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	68	72	95	92	91	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	20	18	20	15	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	20	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	16	35	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	48%	53%	56%				43%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						50%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						51%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	58%	50%	50%				60%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						68%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						54%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	59%	59%				46%	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	36%	52%	-16%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	55%	-17%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
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	16	33	22	25	49	54	6				
ELL	41	44	42	54	63	54	23				
ASN	54			92							
BLK	25			36							
HSP	48	53	33	59	66	55	27				
WHT	65	60		60	60						
FRL	45	53	36	55	61	57	25				

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	18	22	30	20	41	50	12				
ELL	43	53		49	59		31				
BLK	29			33							
HSP	44	49	33	49	56	58	40				
WHT	45			65							
FRL	41	46	30	47	51	55	34				

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	12	36	48	28	55	54	13				
ELL	34	44	52	51	64	58	29				
ASN	86	83		93	83						
BLK	24	50		33	43						
HSP	40	47	49	59	68	57	42				
WHT	59	58		68	65		50				
FRL	41	49	53	57	67	54	42				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	416
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	
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	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
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?

-ELA and Math proficiency and gains increased

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

-Science proficiency decreased from 37% to 32%
- Math bottom quartile decreased minimally
-Even though ELA bottom quartile increased, ELA and Math bottom quartile will be a focus

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

- Standard alignment and purposeful planning for all subjects
-District science resource support to disaggregate data and make informed decisions
- All bottom quartile students will be placed into intervention small groups

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

-Math proficiency
-ELA bottom quartile increased by 6%

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

- Face to face purposeful planning and hands-on instructions
- Providing strategic interventions across content areas
-ELP provided for students in need

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

-Small group instruction across all content areas
- Using formal and informal assessments to drive instruction

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

- PD on Small group instruction and data desegregation
-On the spot coaching opportunities
- Purposeful planning
- In depth study on the Science of Reading with ELA teachers

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

-Morning Planning Sessions
- Strategic coaching support
- Data analysis PLCs

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 Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	It will be important to continue the focus on standards taught in each subject area. We will progress monitor the instruction using a monthly assessment in ELA and Math. We will hold continued planning sessions, coaching of instruction, individual conferencing, and ensure we are strategically accelerating content.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency will increase in each grade level by at least 5% as measured by the statewide assessment in ELA and Math given in Spring 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor using monthly assessments, tracking standards attainment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will hold continued planning sessions, coaching of instruction, individual conferencing, and ensure we are strategically accelerating content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	We have chosen this because this will have the greatest impact on our instruction.

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.

Implement Planning PLCs for all grades and subjects.

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

Conduct Coaching Cycles focused on planning, instruction, use of data, etc.

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

Provide professional development regarding standards aligned instruction, tasks, etc.

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

Conduct informal and formal data chats with students and teachers.

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

Ensure tasks are aligned with grade level standards

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

Ensure instructional strategies and structures are purposeful for lesson.

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Instructional practice specifically related to science instruction because it is our lowest area of proficiency and it is an area where all grade levels are represented in questions.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase proficiency by at least 8% as measured by the SSS given in Spring 2023. We will use the the 9-week progress monitoring tests to assess student performance.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress will be monitored through the use of mini assessments and formative assessments to track standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will ensure there is standards-based planning occurring during planning sessions. We will use small group instruction as necessary with technology to target prior grade levels. As well, fidelity checks will be critical to ensure science instruction is being done in all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	We chose these strategies because we know using standards to drive our instruction is critical. Small group instruction is a way to target difficulties with prior grade level standards. Fidelity checks are a way to ensure accountability of teachers.

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.

Standards based planning with the support of district coach

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

Small group targeted instruction

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

Ensure tasks are aligned with grade level standards.

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

Ensuring implementation of standard aligned lessons.

Person Responsible	Michele Toscani (michele.toscani@hcps.net)

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

Bellamy will implement data informed small groups as well as formal and informal assessments to increase student achievement.

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

Bellamy will implement data informed small groups as well as formal and informal assessments to increase student achievement.

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)

Based on district progress monitoring assessments from the previous year, 39 % of students were not proficient in ELA. This number will decrease by 5%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on statewide assessments from the previous year, 48 % of students were proficient in ELA, with 54% of students making gains. ELA proficiency determined by the current state assessment will show 53% proficient with 60% of students making gains.

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.

Classroom, district, and statewide assessments will be analyze to determine appropriate instructional interventions. Leadership team inclusive of content area coaches will meet weekly to analyze and discuss next steps. Teachers will meet twice a month to discuss trends and problem solve standards showing low proficiency.

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

Toscani, Michele, michele.toscani@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?

Based on ELA Triangulation data, RTI blocks will be used to provide evidence based programs and materials to all students. Students will receive interventions at least four times a week. Administration will conduct monthly fidelity walkthroughs to ensure proper implementation.

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?

Based on triangulation data, teachers will provide strategic interventions. Evaluation of progress will occur at least every six weeks.

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
Ensure training of ELA materials and BEST standards	Toscani, Michele, michele.toscani@hcps.net
Standard Based Planning will be implemented with the assistance of the literacy coach.	Toscani, Michele, michele.toscani@hcps.net
Ensure the rigor of tasks aligned with grade level standards to include small group and use of appropriate assessments.	Toscani, Michele, michele.toscani@hcps.net

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.

Our school sends out weekly verbal and written communication to inform stakeholders of upcoming events and critical information related to instruction. We have three family events to celebrate multiculturalism, holiday spirit,
and a science night. Next year, provided CDC guidelines allow us to do so, we will continue to hold these events for our families. We have multiple business partners who have donated school supplies, backpacks, certificates, coupons for student achievement, and gift cards to purchase items for our students and staff. We partner with other agencies to obtain items for monthly behavior celebrations. Our student services team also provides resources to families for basic needs such as food, clothing, in addition to offering and connecting families with outside counseling services. Often times are families are afforded opportunities for tutoring services through these agencies, but we also partner with a local high school for volunteers and tutors for our students.

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

Parents play a large role in planning and participating in building a positive school culture. We need parents to be able to support the instruction in the school and building a strong climate. Our business partners have already and continue to support us financially, as well as volunteering when we are allowed to do so. We accept donations from other agencies to help with our events for families and students.