Colson Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Colson Elementary School

1520 LAKEVIEW AVE, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Black

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: C (51%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (43%)
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

Colson Elementary School

1520 LAKEVIEW AVE, Seffner, FL 33584

[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	67%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To create successful learners by teaching students to be safe and responsible, be respectful, focus on learning, be a problem solver, and talk it out.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students first.

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
Black, Rebecca	Principal	The principal coordinates administrative oversight and plans all phases of instructional leadership, including educational programs, staff evaluation, office administration, budgetary planning, discipline, professional development, and counseling services. Ensures a productive learning environment through continual collaboration with teachers, students, parents, and community partners.
Woodfork, Lakisha	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the school site principal, assumes responsibilities in the administration of school curriculum, instructional programs, staff development, guidance and evaluation of staff, state and district testing procedures, and general administrative functions. The assistant principal facilitates grade-level collaboration and team meetings, parent conferences, and campus event planning.
Long, Deborah	SAC Member	SAC Chair, Initiates and coordinates SAC Meetings

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/2/2022, Rebecca Black

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

667

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

6

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	108	105	89	112	119	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	1	41	20	33	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	42	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	43	22	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	12	20	29	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	2	7	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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 8/24/2022

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	87	84	89	113	92	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	561
Attendance below 90 percent	28	22	28	28	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	2	0	3	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	23	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	28	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	87	84	89	113	92	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	561
Attendance below 90 percent	28	22	28	28	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	2	0	3	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	23	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	28	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	43%	53%	56%				53%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						63%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						53%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	50%	50%				58%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						68%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						48%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	59%	59%				44%	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	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

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	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%
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	13	44	50	27	50	42	6				
ELL	38	50	54	33	62	57	23				
BLK	34	57	62	45	72	44	9				
HSP	38	53	48	44	68	47	39				
MUL	54	53		58	65						
WHT	50	64		57	70	62	42				
FRL	36	54	52	46	68	50	30				
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	15	13	10	12	5		10				
ELL	32	44		36	31		13				
BLK	35	50		30	35		13				
HSP	37	39		32	24		27				
MUL	54			50							
WHT	48	29		39	39		33				
FRL	38	38	36	32	29	24	21				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	35	32	22	44	33	4				
ELL	30	61	90	48	71	70					
BLK	51	54	46	46	57	48	30				
HSP	48	69	64	51	64	45	30				
MUL	50			73							
WHT	60	67	41	68	77	50	63				
FRL	47	59	54	53	64	49	39				

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	53
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	424
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	48
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	51
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	58
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	58
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	51
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?

Targeted support of SWD across grade levels in reading and mathematics.

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

The lowest performance was in our 5th grade 2022 SSA. Students demonstrate a weakness on standards taught prior to 5th grade.

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

We have focused our efforts in reading and math to make improvements with our students. We have academic coaches in Math and Literacy that support teachers in developing rigorous instruction in these areas, but not the type of support in science. We have not had someone on campus that helps build capacity with instruction in science and supports teachers in the content area. We have built in time to have collaborative planning once a week with the 5th grade science teachers to develop and support rigorous instruction. As a school we are developing schoolwide LTI opportunities for students to make connections to the content.

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

Reading and Math learning gains showed the most improvement.

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

There were consistent data PLCs where teachers met with leadership support to look at data and determine what we were doing to support groups of students. Weekly planning sessions were supported by Math and Literacy coaches to develop rigorous instruction and differentiated for students.

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

Our highest priorities are science and to maintain the learning gains made in Reading and Math. We are incorporating strategies in our weekly planning sessions to support teachers in increasing student discourse and implementing differentiated small groups. Our MTSS Resource teacher will be supporting teachers in providing interventions in reading and math with fidelity.

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.

Professional development will be differentiated based on teacher need and student data. Teachers will be supported through job-embedded professional development, guided learning walks, coaching cycles, and conferencing.

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

Continuous feedback (formal and informal), follow up, and coaching cycles.

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 Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The lowest performance was in our 5th grade 2022 SSA. Students demonstrate a weakness on standards taught prior to 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Through the implementation of weekly collaborative planning in 5th grade science, we will increase science proficiency from 31% to 41% as measured by the 2022 SSA.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-Collaborative planning once a week -Monthly grade level data chats for progress monitoring. -Developing common assessments in planning to monitor student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	• Teacher Clarity- Hattie effect size .75- Teachers should be very clear with students about what they will be learning/are expected to know and how the students "measure up" before, during, and after learning (performance scales)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Teacher Clarity- if the teacher is clear about the learning targets, it will be easier for students to understand what they are learning.

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.	

Weekly collaborative planning sessions, data reviews with the 5th grade teachers, and job-embedded professional development long-term investigation and vocabulary.

Person Responsible	Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our highest priorities are to maintain the learning gains made in Reading and Math. Students with disabilities has been our lowest subgroup for learning gains. Our MTSS Resource teacher will be supporting teachers in providing interventions in reading and math with fidelity.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If teachers utilize targeted small-group instruction in ELA, math, and science, then bottom quartile and subgroups identified by the Federal Index below 41% will have learning gains increased by at least 5% in each area using the following target indicators; Students with Disabilities in ELA 13% to 17%, Math 27% to 32%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-MTSS Resource teacher -Grade level data chats led by team leads to monitor student progress -MTSS Resource teacher modeling interventions and coaching teachers -Monitoring fidelity of reading and math interventions
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Differentiation and 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.	In the journal article, "Differentiated Instruction: A Research Basis", current evidence supports addressing student differences through meeting a variety of learning styles and multiple intelligences. To provide these varied modalities, we need access to personnel, technology, and instructional materials. Implementing differentiated instruction will raise students confidence and motivation levels by providing curriculum rich with embedded growth mindset. Our area of focus levels the playing field for our lowest 25% through a variety of modalities/learning styles, remediation, and enrichment opportunities.

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.

Hire an MTSS Resource teacher to monitor the fidelity of reading and math interventions, coach teachers on the interventions, and monitor student progress.

Person Responsible	Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@hcps.net)

With the Principal, the MTSS Resource teacher will lead teachers in grade-level discussions on progress monitoring data and determine next steps to support student progress.

Person Responsible	Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@hcps.net)

The Principal will get with the ESE Specialist to develop VE Common Planning once a week to plan differentiated small group strategies.

Person Responsible Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@hcps.net)

#3. 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.**	We have focused our efforts in reading and math to make improvements with our students. We have academic coaches in Math and Literacy that support teachers in developing rigorous instruction in these areas. We have built in time to have collaborative planning once a week to support teachers in standards-based instruction.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the FAST assessment will increase to 50% in ELA and 55% in Math through effective questioning (student discourse) and differentiated small groups.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	-Weekly collaborative planning sessions lead by the Literacy and Math coach -Regular feedback from administrators and coaches -Learning Walks -Modeling through job-embedded professional development
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	• Classroom Discussion- Hattie effect size .82- Teachers should embed many times within a lesson that allows for student-to-student discussion around a topic/ skill. • Feedback- Hattie effect size .70- Teachers should be very clear with students on how they "measure up" before, during, and after learning (performance scales) and if they are below expectation, provide students with how they can move towards on-level achievement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	* Classroom Discussion- students need the opportunity to learn from their peers in order to reinforce or push their own thinking and learning. * Feedback- students should have an understanding of the goal, their current level, and how to achieve their goal.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, student engagement discussions and plans during collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@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

Based on Spring 2022 I-Ready Reading scores, 35% of students in Kindergarten, 38% of students in 1st grade and 44% of students in 2nd grade score at proficiency for the end of the year grade level benchmarks. These percentages are indicators of the percentage of students on-track for scoring a level 3 or above on statewide, standardized assessments.

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

Based on the 2022 ELA FSA scores, 42% in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to students entering a grade already below level which impacted their on grade-level performance and showed a need for acceleration to close the existing achievement gap.

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)

The percent of grades K-2 students scoring proficient, will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring 2023 ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of grades 3-5 students scoring proficient, which is a level 3 or higher will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the 2023 ELA state 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.

Students progress in ELA will be progress monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments. This data will be used to set individualized goals, plan for instruction, and monitor students progress toward proficiency.

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

Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@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?

We will implement a planning structure with ELA grade level teams in grades 3-5 that will allow them to internalize the Guiding Question and use it as a basis for backward planning. Within these planning structures, we will incorporate structures and strategies that encourage student discussion, students taking ownership of their work, and active engagement during the ELA block.

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?

In 2022, the data showed the same percentage (42%) of 3-5 students making proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment. The improvement strategy of providing standard-based planning structures focuses core instruction on developing rigorous and meaningful ELA lessons that are purposeful and engage students in critical thinking and reading strategies that will increase reading proficiency.

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
Provide a school wide professional development that teaches teachers how to use student discussion and differentiated small-groups. Administration will set the expectation that student discourse will be identified, taught, posted, and utilized in every classroom. Opportunities for professional development will be designed for each grade level and also embedded into planning sessions.	Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@hcps.net
The reading coach will facilitate planning sessions while incorporating prompting questions that illicit teacher discussion and plans that meet consistent expectations of high quality student discourse.	Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@hcps.net
Conduct walkthrough to collect evidence for student talk and small group. Provide feedback to teachers based on observations.	Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@hcps.net
Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the Guiding Unit question and focus standards. The framework will include the following steps: · Teachers pre-read all texts and tasks provided within the instructional guide. · Literacy Coach will communicate prior to planning what texts/task teachers will be planning with during the session. · Teachers internalize the task by "doing the work" and discussing at planning what knowledge and skills the students will need to have to complete it successfully. · Based on the internalizing work, teachers will then construct daily learning targets that will contain both the skill and strategy needed for the day. · Literacy Coach will guide teachers in creating anchor charts they can use and refer to throughout the week to support instruction and student understanding. · Construct rigorous student tasks aligned to this guiding question and learning target	Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@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.

Below are a list of activities and events that will occur this school year. These activities and events are created,
scheduled, and conducted in an effort to promote a positive school culture and environment.

* School Advisory Committee (SAC): meets monthly and is composed of staff members, community members, and parents. The goal for SAC is to bring stakeholders together to make decisions that are in the best interest of our students.

*ELL Parent Advisory Council: meets twice per year and is composed of our ESOL Resource Teacher, Administration and parents of ESOL students. The purpose of this council is to offer information and support to parents as well as listen to their valuable input.

*Family Reading, Math, & Science Nights: Occur quarterly during the year to support parents in strategies and resources to support learning at home with their student. These events are open to all of our students and families and seek to promote academic achievement and parent/community involvement.

* PTA Fall Festival: once per year, this event brings all of our students, staff, and community members together.

* Great American Teach-In: The event opens the doors to community members and parents and encourages our students to consider various jobs and careers.

C.H.A.M.P.S. & Cougar P.R.I.D.E.- School-wide focus on interpersonal skills and expectations, with weekly recognition for students on positive behavior.

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

SAC: Parent members and school staff meet to collaborate around school issues.

ELL Parent Council: ELL staff and parents meet throughout the year to provide school updates and assess parent/family needs.

PTA: Staff and parents work together for the good of the school.

Staff Passion Project Crews: School and community areas of focus that staff work to develop and grow.

Academic Coaches- meet weekly to review school-wide data and areas of support.

Student Services Team- meet weekly to review MTSS, behavioral data and supports, as well as school mental health and counseling needs.