Chamberlain High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chamberlain High School

9401 N BOULEVARD, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jake Russell

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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

Chamberlain High School

9401 N BOULEVARD, Tampa, FL 33612

[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)
High School 9-12	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	88%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide an environment for students to master disciplinary literacy across all content areas.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Chamberlain, all stakeholders work together to create a learning community where students are held to high expectations. The Chamberlain community builds students who are caring, contributing citizens that can succeed in an ever-changing world.

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
Russell, Jake	Principal	
Woods, Jody	Assistant Principal	
Suarez, Luis	Assistant Principal	
Smith, Jean	Assistant Principal	
Olson, Ashley	SAC Member	
	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/2/2022, Jake Russell

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
77

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,159

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
21

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
18

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	339	258	300	1206
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	119	129	128	514
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	73	66	41	246
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	36	40	0	112
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	231	126	2	452
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	1	91
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	98	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	140	76	1	336

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	49	78	3	182

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 8/15/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334	346	284	306	1270
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	50	34	19	13	116
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	9	3	114
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	8	4	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	4	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5	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	33	27	10	7	77

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334	346	284	306	1270
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	50	34	19	13	116
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	9	3	114
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	8	4	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	4	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5	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	33	27	10	7	77

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	28%	52%	51%				28%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						47%	54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						45%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	22%	39%	38%				40%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	37%						63%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						56%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	33%	46%	40%				42%	69%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	49%	48%				60%	75%	73%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	41%	66%	-25%	67%	-26%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	73%	-15%	70%	-12%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	24%	63%	-39%	61%	-37%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	47%	57%	-10%	57%	-10%

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	23	53	52	21	44	53	14	37		70	11
ELL	14	42	42	10	37	52	17	38		75	46
ASN	47	40		40							
BLK	17	41	42	18	36	60	23	44		80	8
HSP	27	47	47	21	40	47	32	56		77	50
MUL	53	67		21	9		36				
WHT	49	55		32	41	45	52	63		83	48
FRL	26	45	43	22	36	46	32	52		78	31
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	16	29	35	10	35	58	24	39		84	29
ELL	9	34	45	11	30	40	15	31		75	56

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
ASN										100	80
BLK	15	35	46	10	29	44	16	36		89	23
HSP	27	37	45	22	29	38	38	46		85	50
MUL	26	22		21	45		55			73	36
WHT	27	38	45	26	30		38	78		87	61
FRL	23	36	44	17	29	42	32	46		86	42

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	17	45	46	28	61		27	44		78	11
ELL	19	48	41	36	64	50	43	42		71	44
ASN		40						80		100	69
BLK	15	38	44	27	61	57	30	43		84	5
HSP	32	50	41	45	63	62	43	60		80	37
MUL	40	47		33			30	71		86	25
WHT	46	56	71	48	75		66	75		87	48
FRL	25	46	44	38	65	60	39	55		81	24

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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	37
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	44
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	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	52
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	41
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?

Students are significantly below grade level in all contents but especially in English and Math. Student achievement, gains and grad rate has dropped since 2019.

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

Based on state assessments, students greatest need for improvement is in Algebra 1 and Biology. Based on overall achievement, students greatest need for improvement are English and Math.

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

The contributing factors for this need are learning gaps due to Covid, and numerous teacher vacancies and absences. These factors led to a lack of school culture for learning, lack of teacher planning time, and lack of access to student services.

There is a need for a teacher in every classroom, dedicated planning time and planning support, as well as continued professional development on differentiation.

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

English and Math gains showed the most improvement.

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

Chamberlain has implemented multiple levels of supports to BQ English and Math students. Including pushing literacy skills in all contents, literacy and math coaches, and ELP opportunities through out the year.

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

There will be an instructional shift from learning gains to standards achievement. There will be a continued push on literacy. As well as a new push for teacher-led small-groups that utilize data-based differentiation.

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.

Teachers will receive monthly PD on topics that are informed by independent classroom walkthroughs (GEMBA). PLC's will focus on the planning, implementation, and review of literacy incorporation and teacher-led small-groups. There is support provided by the Literacy Coach and Climate and Culture Resource Teacher.

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

There are no vacancies an equitable coverage plan for absences. There is a more organized structure for PLC's, PD's, ILT-GEMBA, Steering, and behavior. There is a Literacy Coach, Climate and Culture Resource Teacher, and two Success Coaches

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 Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Teachers will use student formative data to plan and implement teacher-led small-group instruction. This will allow the teachers to differentiate their lessons to the individual students needs. Providing students with this small-group instruction will help students reach the desired achievement levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By December 2022, at least 50% of all teachers and by May 2023, at least 70% of teachers will implement standards-based, differentiated, teacher-led small-group instruction.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The above goal will be measured by walkthroughs, PLC documentation, coaching logs, support facilitation plans, and student data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher-led small-groups and differentiation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Teachers will target students individual learning needs in the small groups, allowing for differentiation that will facilitate their mastery of desired standards. Teachers have received initial training on standards-based, differentiated, teacher-led small-group instruction. There will be further training continued this year, as well and PLC planning, and leadership support.

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.

The instructional leadership team will conduct GEMBA walkthroughs to collect schoolwide data. This data will inform the areas of need which will become the topics for the monthly Professional Developments.

Person Responsible   Jake Russell (jake.russell@hcps.net)

The content PLC's will create and implement common assessments to use as additional progress monitoring and track students mastery of the standards. The PLCs will review the data collected to determine their small groups. The PLCs will also work together to develop the small group lessons that will remediate, review, or elaborate on the standards.

Person Responsible   Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

The Literacy Coach will work with the English and Reading teachers to plan, implement, and evaluate their teacher-led small-groups.

Person Responsible   Danielle Buchert (danielle.buchert@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

The CCRT will work with new and returning teachers to plan, implement, and evaluate their teacher-led small-groups.

Person Responsible   Danielle Buchert (danielle.buchert@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs and conferences with teachers to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the teacher-led small-groups.

Person Responsible   Jake Russell (jake.russell@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The area of focus will address the subgroups of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black/African American Students, and Multiracial Students. We will target literacy across all disciplines. Students in these subgroups score significantly lower on ELA achievement and gains.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By December 2022, at least 70% of all teachers and by May 2023, at least 90% of teachers will implement literacy into their lessons weekly.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The above goal will be measured by walkthroughs, PLC documentation, coaching logs, and support facilitation plans.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teachers will use disciplinary literacy to enhance their students mastery and analysis of their content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Disciplinary literacy is shown to not only improve students understanding of the content but also supports students overall ELA gains.

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.

The content area PLC's will develop a minimum monthly literacy integrations. This should include the use of text analysis and incorporation of writing. Texts may look different in each content area; some may be articles, letters, pictures, graphs, ect. Writing should be centered around the content to assess both students content knowledge and their writing skill. Writings could range from a short response to a full essay.

Person Responsible	Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

The GEMBA /ILT created Professional Development will incorporate literacy skills and cultural responsiveness whenever possible.

Person Responsible	Jake Russell (jake.russell@hcps.net)

The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs and conferences with teachers to evaluate the implementation of literacy and assess students literacy and content development

Person Responsible	Jake Russell (jake.russell@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

n/a

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)

n/a

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.

n/a

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

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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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

n/a

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.

The school will build a positive school culture by the creation and improvement of systems, increased teacher support and planning time, and increased Student Government Association involvement. Systems have been developed or improved for behavior and management of the building. With a teacher in every classroom and designated planning time, teachers will be able to better support students. The SGA, the CCRT, and the Legacy Alliance will work together to plan and implement culture building activities for students, staff, and the community.

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

Ashley Olson - CCRT
Shannon Maclaughlin - SGA
Terry Sisco - Legacy Alliance
Jean Smith - AP
Jody Rembert - APC
Colleen Mascherin - Literacy Coach
Jennifer Montgomery - Success Coach - 9-10th
Mindy Swary - Success Coach - 11-12th
Jordan Stone - Social Worker
Sarah Pierce - Psychologist
Amanda Schmitt - Social Worker