

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cork 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

Cork Elementary School

3501 N CORK RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sherri Lyn Black

Start Date for this Principal: 8/6/2012

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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%)
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

Cork Elementary School

3501 N CORK RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">57%</p>

School Grades History

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

Cork Elementary exemplifies a safe and nurturing environment where people from diverse cultures and beliefs come together to build confidence, excel in learning, strengthen inter-personal relationships, and be a stellar example of our families, community, and district.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learners today, leaders tomorrow.

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, Sherri	Principal	It is the responsibility of the principal to set the purpose of the leadership team which is to ensure high quality core instructional practices and support interventions and enrichment for students in need of differentiated instruction to be successful.
Manhertz, Rosemarie	Assistant Principal	It is the responsibility of the assistant principal to assist the leadership team and to ensure high quality core instructional practices and support interventions and enrichment for students in need of differentiated instruction to be successful.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/6/2012, Sherri Lyn 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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

678

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.

8

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	93	104	107	118	105	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	28	21	20	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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	39	32	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	45	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	27	37	14	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	2	2	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	101	101	116	111	107	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	19	12	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	5	2	7	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	101	101	116	111	107	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	19	12	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	5	2	7	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	49%	53%	56%				56%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						59%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						54%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	50%	50%				57%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						64%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						55%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	59%	59%				62%	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	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	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	18	47	50	27	35	14	25				
ELL	26	54	58	37	61	50	16				
HSP	38	60	55	41	58	46	23				
MUL	60			50							
WHT	59	60	42	59	63	14	56				
FRL	40	52	45	42	53	30	33				

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	26		17	42	38	8				
ELL	26	42	50	23	49	50	19				
HSP	32	45	50	29	50	46	30				
WHT	62	62		53	62	40	56				
FRL	35	47	60	29	49	42	26				
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	20	56	56	30	51	33	35				
ELL	38	49	52	41	58	61	27				
HSP	45	56	51	46	59	60	37				
WHT	63	60	56	63	69	50	77				
FRL	48	55	53	50	60	54	57				

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	49
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	55
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	50
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	44
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?

The positive trends are that proficiency and overall gains increased in ELA and Math. Conversely, the bottom quartile gains decreased more than ten points in both ELA and Math. Science proficiency remained stagnant.

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

The greatest need is support for students in the bottom quartile for ELA and Math.

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

Teacher vacancies in ESE caused disruption to services for students in the bottom quartile. Substitute staff had insufficient training to implement ESE interventions with fidelity. A fully staffed ESE resource team will address the need for improvement.

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

Proficiency in ELA grew by three points and, Math grew eleven points. Overall gains increased in ELA by seven points and in Math by six points.

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

The continuation of purposeful collaboration and planning for differentiated instruction involving general education teachers and the coaches contributed to the increase in proficiency for both ELA and Math. The use of analyzing formative assessment data and personal goal setting with students led to increased learning gains.

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

Additional training on new curriculum, new state assessments, and how to use the data effectively to plan for differentiated instruction will accelerate learning. Collaborative planning with instructional coaches will further support learning 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.

Based on the data analysis of our bottom quartile students, we discovered that the majority received ELL and/or ESE services. In response, a school-wide book study, How the ELL Brain Learns, has been initiated. One Monday each month, mini-professional development opportunities will be offering instructional strategies to impact accelerated learning for students in the bottom quartile.

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

We shifted our focus from remediation of student learning to accelerating student learning. In addition to analyzing data at grade level and teacher level, the coaches will support the teachers in analyzing and tracking SUBGROUP data quarterly which will contribute to the ILT's ability to create an action plan involving Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle.

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 Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Our data indicates that students in the bottom quartile did not make adequate learning gains.

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

Our FSA Math data indicates that only 30% of all students in the bottom quartile made adequate gains which was a 12% decrease from the previous year. We will increase the percentage of learning gains of students in the bottom quartile in Math by twenty percentage points overall.

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

Learning gains will be monitored by Hillsborough County district assessments and state progress monitoring (PM1 and PM2). In addition to analyzing data at grade level and teacher level, the coaches will support the teachers in analyzing and tracking SUBGROUP data quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)

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

Instructional Coaching in Math will focus on lesson planning with teachers to implement acceleration and differentiation of instruction at all grade levels. This will occur weekly under the supervision of the Principal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Differentiation (1.29) and Acceleration (.68) both have high effectiveness ratings on John Hattie's index of strategies that influence student achievement.

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.

1. Instructional Coaching in Math will focus on implementation of common planning protocols with teachers to support acceleration and differentiation of instruction at all grade levels. This will occur weekly for an hour under the supervision of the Principal.

Person Responsible

Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)

2. Based on the data analysis of our bottom quartile students, we discovered that the majority received ELL and/or ESE services. In response, a school-wide book study, How the ELL Brain Learns, has been initiated. One Monday each month, mini-professional development opportunities will be offering instructional strategies to impact accelerated learning for students in the bottom quartile.

Person Responsible

Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)

3. Daytime tutors will be hired to address "unfinished learning" for our math subgroups of students in the bottom quartile.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#2. 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 data indicated that our overall proficiency in Science remained stagnant at forty-two percent following a twenty percent decrease the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our proficiency in Science will increase on the SSA by twenty percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Proficiency will be monitored by Hillsborough County district standards based mini-assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rosemarie Manhertz (rosemarie.manhertz@hcps.net)

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

Professional development in Science will focus on student accountability and ownership in using student notebooks to document student learning. Teachers will provide feedback to help differentiate support of students learning. This will occur monthly under the supervision of the Assistant Principal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Feedback (.70), Teacher Clarity (.75) and Student Efficacy (.92) all have high effectiveness ratings on John Hattie's index of strategies that influence student achievement.

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.

For Professional Development, the District Science Coach will host four trainings to work on developing instructional pedagogy in Science: Literacy in Science, Thanks for the Feedback, Assess-Now What, and Nature of Science. This will occur under the supervision of the Assistant Principal.

Person Responsible

Rosemarie Manhertz (rosemarie.manhertz@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

Our data reflects a deficit in foundational skills and language comprehension which impedes proficiency.

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

Our data reflects a deficit in foundational skills and vocabulary which impedes proficiency.

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)

Our 2022 final iReady Reading Diagnostic indicates that 39% of all student were on or above grade level. By the end of the 2022-23 school year 50% of all students will be on grade level as measured by the STAR Reading assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our FSA ELA data indicates that 49% of all students were proficient, which is still five percentage points away from the 2019 school year of 54%. Additionally, our student with disabilities (ESE) fell below the ESSA Federal Index Score of 41% proficiency. We will increase the percentage of proficient students in ELA by ten percentage points and increase the subgroup proficiency score to be above the ESSA Federal Index Score of 41%.

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.

Proficiency will be monitored by state progress monitoring twice a year in conjunction with Wonders unit assessments. In addition to analyzing data at grade level and teacher level, the coaches will support the teachers in analyzing and tracking SUBGROUP data quarterly. Brainspring progress monitoring assessments and SIPPS Mastery Tests will be used to progress monitor response to intervention for students receiving ESE services or Tier 3 support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Manhertz, Rosemarie, rosemarie.manhertz@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Instructional Coaching in ELA will focus on lesson planning and data analysis with teachers to implement acceleration and differentiation of instruction at all grade levels. This will occur weekly for one hour under the supervision of the Assistant Principal. The Reading Coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor student response to 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?

Differentiation (1.29), Feedback (.70) and Acceleration (.68) all have high effect ratings on John Hattie's index of strategies that influence student achievement.

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
1. Instructional Coaching in ELA will focus on implementation of common planning protocols with teachers to support acceleration and differentiation of instruction at all grade levels. This will occur weekly for an hour under the supervision of the Assistant Principal.	Manhertz, Rosemarie, rosemarie.manhertz@hcps.net
2. Based on the data analysis of our bottom quartile students, we discovered that the majority received ELL and/or ESE services. In response, a school-wide book study, How the ELL Brain Learns, has been initiated. One Monday each month, mini-professional development opportunities will be offering instructional strategies to impact accelerated learning for students in the bottom quartile.	
3. Daytime tutors will be hired to address "unfinished learning" in reading for our subgroups of students not meeting the 41% ESSA Federal Index Score.	

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.

Our mission statement is long, but truly reflects how we feel about educating our Cork students, "Cork Elementary exemplifies a safe and nurturing environment where people from diverse cultures and beliefs come together to build confidence, excel in learning, strengthen inter-personal relationships, and to be a stellar example of our families, community and district." We use Harmony to teach our students SEL (Social, Emotional Learning) which focuses on diversity and inclusion, empathy and critical thinking, communication, problem solving, and peer relationships. Teachers incorporate the lessons into morning meetings and daily instruction.

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

Administration, Student Services Personnel, ILT, Teachers, Parents, and all staff members work together to promote a positive school culture and safe environment for students.