

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Chiaramonte 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

Chiaramonte Elementary School

6001 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cassandra Smallen

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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

Chiaramonte Elementary School

6001 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[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	60%

School Grades History

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

Prepare students to become successful, productive, and responsible adults.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide an educational foundation that will encourage lifelong learning.

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
Smallen, Cassandra	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Malberg, Paul	Instructional Coach	Serves as SAC co chair, Works with instructional staff to analyze data and provide planning support and resources
Trevino, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Serves as SAC chair, works with students to meet instructional benchmarks
Bostwick, Renee	Other	Works with ESE teachers and students to provide individualized academic and social skills and ensure fidelity of implementation of IEP plans
Kirkner, Sandra	Other	Provide instruction for media center and facilitate check out
Tshiamalenge, Sabrina	Assistant Principal	Work closely with Principal to ensure

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Cassandra Smallen

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

1

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Total number of students enrolled at the school

330

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

8

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

10

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	44	52	42	47	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	289
Attendance below 90 percent	2	20	10	12	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	1	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	3	5	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Wednesday 8/17/2022

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	56	52	49	67	56	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	12	10	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	13	17	20	23	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in Math	16	13	10	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	4	4	11	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	11	9	13	10	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	56	52	49	67	56	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	12	10	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	13	17	20	23	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in Math	16	13	10	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	4	4	11	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	11	9	13	10	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	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	52%	53%	56%				57%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						51%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						46%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	61%	50%	50%				62%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						53%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						32%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	59%	59%				48%	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	57%	52%	5%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
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	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%
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	29	44	33	38	58	42	18				
ELL	47	62		53	77						
BLK	37	56		44	63		30				
HSP	44	65		68	76						
MUL	36			50							
WHT	63	58	25	65	69	50	67				
FRL	50	57	39	60	66	50	44				
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	22	54		39	38		55				
ELL	50			50							
BLK	36			40							
HSP	34			50							
MUL	50			60							
WHT	56	77		60	69		55				
FRL	44	64		51	38		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	39	39	54	51	48	27	27				
ELL	30										
BLK	59	50		54	50		30				
HSP	59	55	50	57	51	45	52				
MUL	56	31		61	46						
WHT	58	58	60	67	59		48				
FRL	55	50	44	55	50	31	43				

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	51
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	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	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	46
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	63
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	43
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	57
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	52
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?

Scores from FSA 2021 to 2022
 Ela proficiency 48% to 52 % increase 4% proficiency .
 ELA Learning gains 63% to 57% decrease of 6%

Math proficiency 55% to 61% increase of 6% proficiency
 Math Learning gains 42% to 67% increase of 25%
 Science 48% to 49% increase 1% proficiency

Overall, our students made increases in areas except for ELA learning gains. There were no Bottom Quartile score in 2021 to compare.

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

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?

Student gains and proficiency will increase when teachers use individual student data to set goals, plan differentiated learning tasks based on the individuals' point of need and regularly monitor student progress towards proficiency.

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

Math learning gains

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

Collaborative planning, ELP- targeted small group instruction, analysis of assessments and planning to include areas of need

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

Increase student engagement (student discourse) and 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.

Instruction coaching and professional development focused on instructional priorities

- 1- Increase student engagement effective questioning leading to opportunities for student conversation, scaffolded small groups, and purposeful independent follow-up with student goal setting.
- 2- Increase student growth in ELA and Math through standards based collaborative planning, data analysis of common assessment, and ongoing reflection of teacher 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 (informal and walkthrough) with actionable feedback
Goal setting for students

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 Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

From 2022 FSA ELA data, there is a need to increase instruction and responsiveness to increase learning gains and bottom quartile proficiency. This can be achieved through structured collaborative planning with a focus on understanding the depth of the grade level benchmarks and the individualized needs of students.

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

Using the new STAR and FAST assessment data, we will increase students proficiency to 70% om (PM3)
 Small group Progress monitoring on a monthly basis to ensure student progress trending to 70% proficiency.

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

PLC will review student data monthly, observations and data analysis will occur throughout the month and be reviewed as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Malberg (paul.malberg@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 and purposeful planning for 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.

Research shows that data driven instruction allows teachers to target specific needs for students and utilize strategies, such as small group instruction, spiral and reteach in order for students to master ELA benchmarks, (Driven by Data).

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.

Reading coach and Admin team will facilitate weekly collaborative planning in grade K- 5.

Person Responsible Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)

District resources will be used for collaborative planning session

Person Responsible Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)

Instruction coaching by Reading coach, regular feedback by admin during classroom instruction to ensure planning is implemented with fidelity

Person Responsible Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)

Students in the SWD subgroup will receive additional small group time with Reading Resources teacher, Media Specialist, and ELP tutor.

Person Responsible Paul Malberg (paul.malberg@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

There is a need to increase instruction and responsiveness to increase learning gains and bottom quartile proficiency. This can be achieved through structured collaborative planning with a focus on understanding the depth of the grade level benchmarks and the individualized needs of students.

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

there is a need to increase instruction and responsiveness to increase learning gains and bottom quartile proficiency. This can be achieved through structured collaborative planning with a focus on understanding the depth of the grade level benchmarks and the individualized needs of students.

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)

70% of K-2 students will achieve proficiency on PM 3 STAR Assessment

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

70% of 3-5 students will achieve proficiency on PM 3 FAST Assessment

Monitoring:

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

PLC will review student data monthly, observations and data analysis will occur throughout the month and be reviewed as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Smallen, Cassandra, cassandra.smallen@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?

Collaborative planning

Small group instruction

Data Analysis for purposeful data driven instruction

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?

Research shows that data driven instruction allows teachers to target specific needs for students and utilize strategies, such as small group instruction, spiral and reteach in order for students to master ELA benchmarks, (Driven by Data and Hattie's Visible Learning).

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
Literacy Leadership Collaborative planning Teacher team (mentoring) Learning walks	Malberg, Paul, paul.malberg@hcps.net
Literacy Coaching Learning Walks Instructional coaching cycles	
Assessment Data Analysis Student goal setting	Smallen, Cassandra, cassandra.smallen@hcps.net
Professional Learning Book Study Monthly PD	

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 attend and be a part of our school events by sending home flyers, parent links, phone calls and posting to our website and social media. We focus on communicating every child's progress by engaging parents and 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, social worker, parents and 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 social worker, school psychologist, and administration meet bi- weekly to review school mental health and that counseling needs are met.