

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cannella Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cannella Elementary School

10707 NIXON RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angela Ventura

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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: B (59%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (57%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cannella Elementary School

10707 NIXON RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[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	80%

School Grades History

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

R3 = Success

Responsibility + Relationships + Respect = Success!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cannella Elementary will prepare students for life.

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
Ventura, Angela	Principal	The principal is responsible for administering and supervising the total school program and providing educational leadership for the students and staff members consistent with the educational goals of the community. These goals include establishing a climate conducive to learning, defining roles, planning and coordinating programs, effecting change, and decision-making.
Beltran, Lizzette	Assistant Principal	Under direction of the principal, assists with administering and supervising the total school program and providing educational leadership for students and staff members consistent with the educational goals of the community. These goals include establishing a climate conducive to learning, planning, and coordinating programs, affecting change, and decision making.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Angela Ventura

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.*

4

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Total number of students enrolled at the school

591

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

3

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	87	90	77	90	76	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	21	21	19	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	
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	3	21	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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

Saturday 8/27/2022

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	83	76	80	83	94	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	504
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	83	76	80	83	94	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	504
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	58%	53%	56%				60%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						54%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						42%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	67%	50%	50%				67%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						59%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						43%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	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	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	66%	54%	12%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
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	11	38	35	29	62	46	6				
ELL	54	48		75	70		25				
ASN	91	82		100	91						
BLK	54	72		57	69	70	54				
HSP	59	60	35	66	70	56	44				
WHT	52	68		66	75						
FRL	57	62	39	67	72	67	49				
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	8	14		18	36	30					
ELL	48	45	18	56	45	50	30				
ASN	69			81							
BLK	56			32							
HSP	55	53	25	61	54	47	49				
WHT	51	27		71	64		55				
FRL	53	49	20	57	51	50	46				
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	14	28	33	20	42	42	28				
ELL	29	49	56	53	60	53	29				
ASN	82	71		100	57						
BLK	76	59		57	44	25	53				
HSP	55	54	45	64	59	46	51				
MUL	67			83							
WHT	56	39		69	69		59				
FRL	58	55	43	64	57	42	51				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
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	58
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	91
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	63
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	59
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	65
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	61
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?

We are moving in an upward trend,. However, we need to continue targeted support of SWD across grade levels in reading and mathematics.

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

The lowest performance was in lowest 25th percentile and ELA learning gains.

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

We need to continue focusing on strategic small group instruction, increase in student engagement and data analysis to ensure targeted instruction to narrow educational gaps while also embedding rigorous opportunities for all.

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

Our ELA lowest 25th percentile grew tremendously, as well as overall learning gains in both ELA and mathematics.

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

Standards based planning (grade level and vertical planning), analysis of assessments and planning to include areas of need, and intentional practices and meaningful follow up as a result of core instruction (small groups and independent work aligned to standards).

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

Increased student engagement (student discourse), differentiated small group with acceleration.

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.

Instructional coaching and professional development focused on instructional priorities:

Priority #1: Increase student engagement through: effective questioning leading to opportunities for student discourse; differentiated small groups (guided reading, flexible needs) and purposeful independent follow up.

Priority #2: Increase student growth in ELA and Math through standards-based planning, data analysis of common assessments, and ongoing reflection of teaching practices.

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

Continuous feedback (formal and informal) and differentiated, individualized professional development.

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.

Based on trend FSA data, teachers need professional development meeting the academic needs of students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase student growth in ELA and Math through standards-based planning, data analysis of common assessments, and ongoing reflection of teaching practices.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Observations and data analysis of formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Instructional coaching, data meetings-data analysis to differentiate instruction, purposeful planning of small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of small group 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.

Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans for differentiated instruction and use of formal assessments (exit cards) to drive instructional practices (targeted small groups based on data), and monitoring of SWD performance on school and district assessments.

Person Responsible

Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on our SWD rate of progress, we have identified the need for more targeted support for our SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Provide differentiated small groups (guided reading, flexible needs) in reading and mathematics as a result of ongoing formative assessments (running records, math and ELA class formative assessments).

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Observations and data analysis of formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Instructional coaching, data meetings-data analysis to differentiate instruction, purposeful planning of small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of small group 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.

Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans for differentiated instruction and use of formal assessments (exit cards) to drive instructional practices (targeted small groups based on data), and monitoring of SWD performance on school and district assessments.

Person Responsible

Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@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

Based on the 2022 ELA FSA Scores, 42% in grade 3 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score demonstrates our need to continue differentiating instruction to meet academic needs and narrow instructional gaps, while also providing rigorous opportunities. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include all students receiving high levels of rigorous instruction, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on grade 3 ELA FAST scores.

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)

The percent of grade 3 students scoring at grade level on the FAST assessment will be at least 10% higher than the previous FSA proficiency score.

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.

Informal and formal observations and feedback, data meetings analyzing students' proficiency as measured by PM 1, 2, and 3, as well as iReady Diagnostic 1 and 2 data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Beltran, Lizzette, lizzette.beltran@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?

Instructional coaching in reading, collaborative planning sessions, data meetings-data analysis to differentiate instruction, purposeful planning of small group instruction, facilitated by reading coach.

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?

ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of small group instruction.

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
Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans for differentiated instruction and use of formal assessments (exit cards) to drive instructional practices (targeted small groups based on data).	Beltran, Lizzette, lizzette.beltran@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 encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home flyers, making parent link calls, sending a monthly Principal Newsletter, and posting everything on our website and social media. We focus on communicating every child's progress to families by engaging parents in parent/teacher conferences and sending home quarterly progress notes. School staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. We value building positive relationships with families.

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

PBIS school committee, Administration, School Counselor, Parents, Teachers all collaborate to ensure school wide PBIS expectations are met and student incentives align with these expectations. There is constant communication with parents in order to promote positive and safe behaviors. Additionally, the school counselor, school social worker, school psychologist and administration meet weekly to review school mental health and counseling needs are met.