Bing Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bing Elementary School

6409 36TH AVE S, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Holley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (49%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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

Bing Elementary School

6409 36TH AVE S, Tampa, FL 33619

[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	83%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To empower students to take ownership of their academic achievement and practice positive character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bing Elementary envisions every child will attain unlimited educational possibilities while being a responsible productive and caring citizen.

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
Cook, Kimberly	Principal	
Valenti, Wayne	Assistant Principal	
Berk, Christina	Instructional Coach	
Concepcion, Danielle	Attendance/Social Work	Social Worker
Hollingshed, Shemia	School Counselor	Counselor
Clarke, Maria	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESOL Resource Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/2/2021, Cheryl Holley

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.*
13

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

442

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

2

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

7

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	64	66	81	86	79	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	25	29	45	29	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	20	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	29	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
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	2	1	12	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	1	1	20	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/18/2022

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	53	63	57	90	58	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	24	27	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	37	32	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	30	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	53	63	57	90	58	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	24	27	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	37	32	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	30	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	30%	53%	56%				45%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						50%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						50%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	50%	50%				68%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						81%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						73%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	21%	59%	59%				56%	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	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
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	5	42	50	10	42						
ELL	36	68	75	49	77	73	19				
BLK	18	26		43	74		13				
HSP	35	65	65	45	70	60	24				
MUL	42			58							
WHT	24	47		51	74						
FRL	29	54	62	47	71	58	20				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	41		20	29		7				
ELL	30	63		39	56		22				
BLK	12	13		14	27		8				
HSP	40	65		42	50		34				
MUL	36			29							
WHT	30	69		50	62		15				
FRL	31	50	47	35	41	24	22				

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	13	20	19	48	67	46					
ELL	41	47	50	69	87	72	42				
BLK	28	37	50	47	70	46	27				
HSP	48	54	55	74	85	83	57				
WHT	51	52		71	78		75				
FRL	43	50	50	66	82	74	52				

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	48
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	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	49
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	47
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?

There was an increase in learning gains and BQ learning gains in ELA and Math. ELA learning gains increased 4%, ELA BQ learning gains increased 22%, Math learning gains increased 30%, Math BQ learning gains increased 36%. Math proficiency increased 10% to 47%. There is still a need to increase proficiency in all areas ELA proficiency is at 30%, Math proficiency is at 47%, and Science proficiency is at 21%.
The Federal Index for SWD continues to be below 41% at 30% and Black/African American Students fell below the 41% Federal Index at 38%.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in ELA (30%) and Science (21%) Proficiency. In addition, we need to show improvement in both the SWD and Black/African American Subgroups and increase the score on the Federal Index.

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

Students began the year with significant learning loss, due to the pandemic. Because of this student's performed below proficiency for the 2020-2021 school year. A substantial amount of students made learning gains in the 2021-2022 school year but continue to perform below proficiency.
We now have a Reading and Math Coach who are working with the teachers, including our ESE Resource teachers to support them in planning, modeling lessons, and coteaching with the teachers in order to ensure that teachers are providing high quality, rigorous instruction, that is aligned to the standards. In addition, we have a

certified teacher who will be providing intervention support for our students who are performing below level, through ELP (Extended Learning Program).

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

There was a significant increase in learning gains and BQ learning gains in ELA and Math. ELA learning gains increased 4%, ELA BQ learning gains increased 22%, Math learning gains increased 30%, Math BQ learning gains increased 36%. Math proficiency increased 10% to 47%.

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

We provided targeted intervention and accelerated instruction to our students, and provided intense support to our BQ students. Because of these actions, students were able to make significant learning gains.

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

Weekly planning sessions with our Reading and Math Coach will be held to ensure the students are receiving rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards, with opportunities built in to lessons to accelerate learning.

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.

-Student Engagement Strategies
-Purposeful Planning
-Differentiated PD sessions based on individual teacher and student needs as classroom observations occur and student data is analyzed.
-Coteaching and Modeling sessions for teachers with our Reading and Math Coach, as needed.

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

We have a reading and Math Coach this year that are working with the teachers providing support in planning, modeling lessons, and coteaching with the teachers in order to ensure that teachers are providing high quality, rigorous instruction, that is aligned to the standards. In addition, we have a certified teacher who will be providing intervention support for our students who are performing below level, through ELP (Extended Learning Program)

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	A critical need was found in our ESSA subgroup-Students with Disabilities because there was only a Federal Index of 30%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	100% of Students with Disabilities will make learning gains from PM1 to PM3 on the FAST assessment and 55% of our Students with Disabilities will obtain proficiency on the PMA3 FAST assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student data from the Progress Monitoring Assessments will be monitored to ensure the students are making learning gains from PM1 to PM3 on the FAST assessment and be on target for proficiency on the PM3 FAST assessment. Wonders assessment data will be tracked to monitor progression of the Reading standards/benchmarks. IEP's will be monitored to ensure the mastery of the IEP goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Instructional Coaching: effect size-.88 Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction: effect size 0.75 Coaching towards Differentiation: effect size 1.29 Comprehensive interventions for students who are learning disabled: effect size .77 Small Group Instruction: effect size .49
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Utilizing instructional coaching and planning will help teachers provide rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards. Students will receive comprehensive intervention/differentiated instruction in small groups, as needed. This will in turn improve student achievement.

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.

Instructional Coaching, Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction, and Coaching with Differentiation will all be done with the Reading and Math Coach.

Comprehensive Intervention/Differentiated Small Group Instruction will be provided in the 3-5 classrooms by the ESE Resource Teacher.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)

#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.**	A critical need was found in our ESSA subgroup-Black/African American because there was only a Federal Index of 38%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	55% of Black/African American Students will perform at the proficient level based on data from the FAST assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student data from the ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments will be monitored to ensure the students are on on target for proficiency on the PM3 ELA FAST assessment. Wonders assessment data will be tracked to monitor progression of the Reading standards/benchmarks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Instructional Coaching: effect size-.88 Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction: effect size 0.75 Coaching towards Differentiation: effect size 1.29 Small Group Instruction: effect size .49
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Utilizing instructional coaching and planning will help teachers provide rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards. Students will receive differentiated instruction in small groups, as needed. This will in turn improve student achievement.

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.

Instructional Coaching, Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction, and Coaching with Differentiation will all be done with the Reading and Math Coach,
Differentiated Small Group Instruction will be done in the 3-5 classrooms with the Classroom Teacher.
The certified ELP teacher will provide small group intervention to the students in order to increase student proficiency.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	A critical need was found in ELA from our FSA data which showed that only 30% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient in Reading.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	55% of our students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency in Reading on the ELA PM3 FAST assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student data from the ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments will be monitored to ensure the students are on on target for proficiency on the PM3 ELA FAST assessment. Wonders assessment data will be tracked to monitor progression of the Reading standards/benchmarks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Instructional Coaching: effect size-.88 Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction: effect size 0.75 Coaching towards Differentiation: effect size 1.29 Small Group Instruction: effect size .49
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Utilizing instructional coaching and planning will help teachers provide rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards. Students will receive differentiated instruction in small groups, as needed. This will in turn improve student achievement.

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.

Instructional Coaching, Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction, and Coaching with Differentiation will all be done with the Reading Coach.
Differentiated Small Group Instruction will be done in the 3-5 classrooms by the classroom teacher.
The certified ELP teacher will provide small group intervention to the students in order to increase student proficiency.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)

#4. 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.**	A critical need was found in Science from our FSA data which showed that only 21% of our students in Grade 5 are proficient in Science.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	55% of our students will score in the proficient range on the Grade 5 Florida Statewide Science Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Student data from the Science Beginning of Year, Mid year and End of Year Assessment will be monitored to ensure the students are on on target for proficiency on the Grade 5 Florida Statewide Science Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Instructional Coaching: effect size-.88 Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction: effect size 0.75 Coaching towards Differentiation: effect size 1.29 Small Group Instruction: effect size .49 Professional Development offered to teachers to improve instructional practice/teaching strategies: effect size .62
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Utilizing instructional coaching and planning will help teachers provide rigorous instruction that is aligned to the Science standards. Students will receive differentiated instruction in small groups, as needed. Science PD sessions will be held at the school by the Science Department. This will in turn improve student achievement.

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.

Instructional Coaching with Math/Science Coach
Planning Sessions with Math/Science Coach in order for teachers to plan rigorous, standards aligned instruction.
Science PD sessions given by the Science Department

Person Responsible   Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@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

N/A

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

The percentage of students who scored below a Level 3 on the 2022 ELA assessment is:
Third Grade-79%
Fourth Grade-47%
Fifth Grade-77%

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Student proficiency in grades 3-5 on the 2023 PM3 FAST Assessment will increase to 55%.

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.

Student data from the ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments will be monitored to ensure the students are on target for proficiency on the PM3 ELA FAST assessment.
Wonders assessments will be used to track progression on the Reading standards/benchmarks.
Classroom Walkthrough data will be analyzed to ensure that teachers are providing rigorous, standards aligned instruction in the area of Reading.

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

Cook, Kimberly, kimberly.cook@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. Â§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?

We have a Reading and Math Coach this year that are working with the teachers providing support in planning, modeling lessons, and coteaching with the teachers in order to ensure that teachers are providing high quality, rigorous instruction, that is aligned to the B.E.S.T standards. In addition, we have a certified teacher who will be providing targeted intervention support for our students who are performing below level, through ELP (Extended Learning Program).

Instructional Coaching: effect size-.88
Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction: effect size 0.75
Coaching towards Differentiation: effect size 1.29
Small Group Instruction: effect size .49

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?

The rationale for choosing these practices is the high impact that they will have on improving Reading Instruction and student achievement in Reading. According to the work of Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey, and John Hattie the practices we have chosen to increase Reading proficiency have the following effect size:
Instructional Coaching: effect size-.88
Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction: effect size 0.75
Coaching towards Differentiation: effect size 1.29
Small Group Instruction: effect size .49

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
The Reading Coach will meet at least weekly with each grade level to provide support to the classroom teachers in planning lessons that are rigorous and aligned to the B.E.S.T standards.	Cook, Kimberly, kimberly.cook@hcps.net
The Reading Coach will coteach or model lessons for the classroom teachers to ensure that instruction is rigorous, targeted, and aligned to the B.E.S.T standards.	Cook, Kimberly, kimberly.cook@hcps.net
Professional Development will be provided in the area of Best Practices in Reading and Standards Aligned Instruction.	Cook, Kimberly, kimberly.cook@hcps.net
Small group, differentiated, targeted instruction will be provided by a certified teacher (ELP) for students who need intensive intervention in the area of Reading.	Cook, Kimberly, kimberly.cook@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.

We utilize a schoolwide PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Support) program. Students are given Bing Bucks for good behavior. These Bing Bucks are used to purchase items or participate in activities during our monthly PBIS event.
We have a Character Education program and focus on a positive character trait each month. At the end of the month there is a Kids for Character celebration to recognize those students who have exhibited those traits that month.
We implement the 7 mindsets (Social Emotional Learning Curriculum). My counselor provides instruction/ training on the 7 mindsets to the teachers, staff, and students.

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

The following stakeholders assist in promoting a positive school culture and environment at Bing:

Administration team-Kimberly Cook-Principal, Wayne Valenti-Assistant Principal, Laura Edwards-Assistant Principal (Promote PBIS, Character Education, and 7 Mindsets program)

Shemia Hollingshed-School Counselor (Promotes and trains students, staff , and teachers on PBIS, Character Education, and 7 Mindsets program, sets up and monitors PBIS and Character Education events)

Danielle Concepcion-School Social Worker (Promotes and trains students, staff , and teachers on PBIS, Character Education, and 7 Mindsets program, sets up and monitors PBIS and Character Education events)

Ericka Delisme-Parent Liaison (Sets up and monitors PBIS and Character Education events)

Elaine Brenaman-ESE Resource Teacher (Sets up and monitors PBIS and Character Education events)