Claywell Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Claywell Elementary School

4500 NORTHDALE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
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 (57%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Claywell Elementary School

4500 NORTHDALE BLVD, 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	No	83%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

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.

Claywell Elementary will provide a collaborative, nurturing environment that empowers all individuals to be productive and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Claywell Elementary students will become respectful citizens and lifelong learners.

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
Jones, Robert	Principal	The leadership Team meets regularly. The purpose of this core is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the MTSS process at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at all levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of goals in curriculum, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. The principal is the instructional leader of the school and maintains the facility.
Wilson, Novenda	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is an instructional leader emphasizing curriculum. She is the school's testing coordinator and program developer. She assists the principal in maintaining the school's high expectations for all.
Stockslager, Lauren	School Counselor	The guidance counselor is a support. She addresses CST, MTSS, and 504 plans. She holds guidance lessons, small group and individual counseling along with peer mediation/conflict resolution. She oversees the mentoring program.
Berberich, Mariah	Attendance/ Social Work	The social worker monitors attendance. She coordinates the school-wide house program. She assists the guidance counselor and psychologist as a support.
Wiles, Katharine	Psychologist	Screening and testing students. Assists with CST/MTSS. Supports guidance and social worker.
Collins, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	TTD - Planning, PD, and assisting teachers with instructional practices.
Dunlap, Diane	Teacher, K-12	TTD- Planning, PD, and assisting teachers with instructional practices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/31/2022, Robert Jones

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

642

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.

3

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	111	79	116	106	102	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	2	22	24	23	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	6	5	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	0	4	3	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	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/18/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	119	100	98	108	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	15	17	19	15	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	13	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	14	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	6	4	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	79	119	100	98	108	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	15	17	19	15	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	13	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	14	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	6	4	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	59%	53%	56%				64%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						57%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						49%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	50%	50%				63%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						53%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						34%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	59%	59%				50%	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	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	65%	54%	11%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	53%	-7%
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	22	37	40	35	46	45	14				
ELL	46	47	47	62	75	86	40				
BLK	68	54		50	67						
HSP	51	52	40	63	73	72	47				
MUL	58	58		53	67						
WHT	71	64	40	72	72		59				
FRL	47	48	37	57	69	62	41				

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	28	23	13	25	43	47	20				
ELL	47	43		47	48		45				
ASN	60			50							
BLK	50	36		25	15		23				
HSP	55	46	31	47	46	43	44				
MUL	56			56							
WHT	68	53		65	50		69				
FRL	51	44	26	41	39	35	39				

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	37	47	50	34	47	31	26				
ELL	44	48	27	47	46	36					
BLK	52	46		46	31						
HSP	57	62	50	56	48	31	36				
MUL	92			69							
WHT	73	54	50	75	62	50	71				
FRL	55	54	51	57	49	40	48				

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	91
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	62
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	60
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	61
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	59
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 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	63
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	57
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?

After past years of declining scores, FSA proficiency scores in math increased by 13%. ELA proficiency scores remained the same as last year while Science proficiency scores dropped by 1%. Math is the strongest content area. Proficiency, gains, and bottom quartile shared increased percentages from 2021-2022. There were also gains in ELA including those of the bottom quartile.
Third and fourth grades were above 50% proficiency in both ELA and math while Fifth graders were in only math and science. This follows the trend of 2021's fourth graders being below the 50% threshold in ELA. They remained below 50% proficient last year (2022) too. Our bottom quartile, which consists mainly of our students with disabilities, showed an increase from last year's data, but are part of the ESSA subgroups not reaching the needed 41% (40%).

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

Science proficiency is stagnate. The past three years of test scores show minimal growth. ELA proficiency did not change during the past two years. If Math can improve dramatically, then so can other content areas. Grade 5 ELA scores were still below the 50% threshold as they were the year before. This is the same group as in the past as denoted in the RAISE section. Students with disabilities need to increase further to match our other subgroups.

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

Typically, ELA and Science share similar scores. There's much required reading for science questions as well as content knowledge. Even though the science test is given in fifth grade, questions are based

on content from previous grade levels. We had several students return from elearning last year with academic gaps. Acceleration was required to bridge those gaps in each grade level. We focused on more fusing into classrooms for ESE and AGP. This year, AGP will mainly pull out intermediate students. ESE will be a combination of both services. Specific learning strategies will be used with all subgroups.

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

Math was the most improved area. There were gains in all areas. These gains were substantial (42-70%) including the bottom quartile (38-59%).

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

There was a focus on math content. Math monthlies and ELP during the day occurred. Math lunch bunches were held by several staff members. The Leadership team tracked student progress and individually met after assessments with bottom quartile students.

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

Grade level collaborative planning with TTD will address acceleration. Building content gaps through "on time" learning prior to grade level instruction will provide background and scaffold learning for students. Progress monitoring will determine if and what differentiation will be required. Using student learning styles to differentiate will yield the most effective results.

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.

Staff professional development began during August's preplanning. The District Professional Study Day covered standard-aligned content areas of ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. Content was shared through instructional guides and instructional practices. New resources for ELA and Math were introduced. We continue our ESE professional development in September with Tim Waite returning for ESE practices. Our TTD will facilitate grade level collaborative planning to assist with accelerated learning and strategies. They will assist teachers on modeling strategies and providing ongoing staff development.

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

Systems in place need to be continued and refined regarding collaborative planning, PLC's, progressive monitoring, and ELP. ESE and ELL personnel support staff and students. Administration continues classroom walkthroughs and feedback. Student engagement must be present and monitored in every classroom. Students set academic goals and track their own progress. Awareness of mental health needs to continue to enable students to do their best.

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 Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Student engagement is essential to promote student learning. Learning activities must be aligned to the standards and include student participation. Explicit teaching strategies for all students is the key. Last year, we focused on student discussion including within small remediation groups. This year we will continue the discussion strategy as well as differentiation and learning styles. In addition, several staff members held weekly math lunch bunch groups. FSA Math data showed an increase in proficiency (51-64%), gains increase (42-70%), and bottom quartile increase (38-59%). Our FSA ELA proficiency remained the same (59%). Gains increased (47-55%) and bottom quartile increased (25-41%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Maintain high level academic student engagement through discussion, differentiation, and learning style teaching strategies as measured by increased student achievement through progress monitoring assessments from Fall 2022 to Spring 2023. Last year's proficiency FSA scores were 64% for math and 59% for ELA. Focused student engagement will result in grades 3-5 proficiency levels rising to 80% by Spring 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Progress Monitoring Assessment is given three times per year: PMA 1 (August-September), PMA 2 (December-January), and PMA 3 (May).These assessments will be monitored by the school's Leadership Team. Data will be reviewed through grade level collaborative planning with TTD, and grade level PLC's.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	One single strategy may not always work. We will follow three specific strategies. Student discussion increases student engagement. Students orally elaborate their thoughts, justify their thinking, and ask one another about their thinking. Differentiation as a planned response to intervention increases student engagement. Students are met where they are and scaffolded to where they need to be. Relating content to student learning styles will increase student engagement as students have the opportunity for visual, auditory, and kinesthetic classroom experiences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	John Hattie's visible learning research uses .40 as a hinge point of effectiveness. Student engagement by itself is .56 on the scale. Adding discussion (.82), differentiation (1.29) and explicit teaching strategies (.57) within instructional practices leads to an even higher effect size.

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.

To address ESSA subgroup - Students with Disabilities:
ESE case managers communicate IEP goals and accommodations to all classroom teachers in August. Update monthly.
Preplanning PD by Tim Waite - Specially Designed Instruction in Co-Taught Classroom

Person Responsible	Novenda Wilson (novenda.wilson@hcps.net)

Planning for engagement through strategies:
Weekly collaborative planning sessions with TTD.
Weekly grade level PLC's

Person Responsible	Brittany Collins (brittany.collins@hcps.net)

Leadership conducts bi-monthly school walkthroughs to track student engagement including students with disabilities.
Monitor progress at Leadership meetings
Provide feedback on instructional practices

Person Responsible	Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

ESE/ELL Support
Provide resources to classroom teachers

Person Responsible	Novenda Wilson (novenda.wilson@hcps.net)

Support Staff - Focus on removing educational barriers to improve student success
Poor attendance - Social Worker
Mental Health - Classroom, small group, and individual counseling - Guidance Counselor

Person Responsible	Lauren Stockslager (lauren.stockslager@hcps.net)

Parent/Family Engagement
Literacy Night
SMATH Night

Person Responsible	Novenda Wilson (novenda.wilson@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Progress monitoring during grade level PLC's have been ongoing the past few years. Procedures continue to be frequently updated. Data discussions focused on assessment results .After viewing data, student differentiation needs to be better monitored. Last year grade levels determined their weekly meetings. They were not always held with fidelity. This year, collaborative grade level meetings are scheduled and facilitated by our TTD. Consistent grade level collaborative planning will aid in targeting instructional strategies to meet student needs.
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 65% of all K-5 teachers and by May 2023, at least 90% of all teachers will implement standards- aligned lessons developed during weekly collaborative planning sessions as measured by the school created walkthrough form. This will result in increasing proficiency to 80% as measured by the progress monitoring assessment in Spring 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	A schedule of collaborative planning sessions will be maintained and outcomes reported weekly by TTD. Conduct bi-monthly administrative walkthroughs recording observations on the school walkthrough form. Results will be discussed during Leadership meetings and shared with school staff.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Progress monitoring students during lessons enables teachers to adjust their instruction. Giving teachers the opportunity to plan together and adjust their instructional practices enables students to greater achievement. By including students, this will help build buy-in support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for	John Hattie's visible learning research uses .40 as the hinge point of effectiveness. The areas of Evaluation and reflection (.75) on the scale, with feedback as (.70), are well above the hinge point leading to greater effectiveness.

selecting this strategy.

Hold grade level weekly collaborative planning sessions.
Maintain schedules, agenda, and outcome reports.
Discuss differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Brittany Collins (brittany.collins@hcps.net)

Monitor progress during weekly grade level PLC's. Team Leaders outcome report.
Maintain and update data walls.
Compare progress monitoring assessments.
Leadership Team reviews data.

Person Responsible	Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

Follow aggressive monitoring techniques during class instruction.
Posted class rubrics for student evaluation.
Students set academic goals and track progress with classroom teacher.
Apply technology applications during instruction.

Person Responsible	Novenda Wilson (novenda.wilson@hcps.net)

Leadership completes bi-monthly school walkthrough form to track instructional practices.
Leadership team reviews data.
Provide feedback on instructional practices.

Person Responsible	Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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

NA at this time

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

Based on the 2022 ELA FSA scores, 45% in grade 5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was related to the 2021 ELA FSA scores of 48% in grade 4. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include teacher and student clarity of the standards-aligned to instruction, student discussion, vocabulary, comprehension, and performance assessment tasks resulting in 80% student proficiency on the grade 5 Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring Assessment.

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)

NA at this time

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of 5th grade students scoring as proficient or higher on Spring 23 ELA Progress Monitoring Assessment will increase to 80% as measured by the Spring 23 Progress Monitoring 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.

The strategy effectiveness will be measured through grade 5 Spring 23 ELA Progress Monitoring Assessment. It will also be monitored throughout the year by teacher observations, specific teaching strategies, and data collection. Administrative walkthroughs will include checking for these strategies. Data will be entered on the school's grade level data wall.

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

Jones, Robert, robert.jones@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Increase student engagement through quality student discussion. Students elaborate their thoughts, justify their thinking and share with other students. Provide opportunities for students to ask and answer questions to better understand text they read. Build student's word knowledge to make sense of the text. Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read. Teachers monitor and assess during and after their instruction to plan for needed differentiation. Instruction is aligned to the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence-based practices will address student needs. They have a proven record of effectiveness. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning research, discussion has a effectiveness scale score of .82 where .40 is the hinge point. According to WWC (What Works Clearing House), the practices of vocabulary and comprehension provide strong evidence for literacy success.

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
Planning for engagement through strategies. Weekly collaborative planning sessions with TTD. Weekly grade level PLC.	Jones, Robert, robert.jones@hcps.net
Literacy teachers attend ELA content training on Professional Study Day. Literacy contact meets with literacy teachers to discuss implementation strategies.	Wilson, Novenda, novenda.wilson@hcps.net
Teachers model and implement the vocabulary and comprehension strategies in their instruction. Leadership conducts bi-monthly walkthroughs to track student engagements strategies.	Jones, Robert, robert.jones@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.

Claywell builds a positive school culture and environment by having common school-wide expectations and policies for all students to follow. Every staff member on campus is part of our House System. Houses promote positive school culture through celebrations.
We have various organizations to reach out to parents and the community. Business partners function with PTA to provide supplies and support. Our food pantry sends out weekend backpacks to families.
Instructional practices and results are discussed and monitored through SAC.
We communicate through our website, newsletters, parent links, and texts. Parent/teacher conferences are held throughout the year. Family nights, such as Literacy and SMATH, are academically based highlighting

content activities for students and parents.
Mental Health is addressed from the Panorama Insight Survey.

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

Teachers hold morning class meetings to promote a sense of family and build a positive school culture. These meetings also address a positive mental mindset.
Guidance holds quarterly classroom guidance lessons as well as small group and individual counseling .Mindful mornings will focus on mental health. While grade levels are collaboratively planning in the mornings, support staff will meet with those grade level students.
Our Social Worker organizes the House System. Staff and students are placed within 6 houses. Each house is identified by color and character trait. These traits are highlighted during the year. Students are awarded house points for positive expectations. Weekly and monthly celebrations are followed throughout the year.
Leadership, MTSS, CST, and Steering meetings provide support for students. TTD provides support for teachers. SAC addressed the school's focus and strategies for improvement.
PTA assists with our culture. They provide additional resources and learning opportunities for our students.
We collaborate with universities to have interns on campus. This has helped us obtain excellent teachers.