

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Crestwood Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Crestwood Elementary School

7824 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Diane Sanchez**

Start Date for this Principal: 3/28/2017

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (60%)<br>2018-19: B (55%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Crestwood Elementary School

7824 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">95%</p>                |

## School Grades History

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

We will empower all students to become creative thinkers and respectful, responsible citizens.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Strive for P.R.I.D.E.

- P - Positive
- R - Respectful
- I - Innovative
- D - Driven
- E - Engaged

### 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  |
|----------------|----------------|--|
| Sanchez, Diane | Principal      | <p>The principal's job duties and responsibilities consists of the following, but are not limited to what is listed below as the position is always evolving and they evaluate each incident and do what is in the best interest of the student body.</p> <p>Conducting leadership team meetings, which can include the following members:<br/>                     Principal<br/>                     Assistant Principal<br/>                     ELP Coordinator<br/>                     Guidance Counselor<br/>                     SAC Chair<br/>                     School Psychologist<br/>                     Social Worker / Attendance representative<br/>                     Behavior team representative<br/>                     Academic coaches<br/>                     ESE teachers<br/>                     PLC Liaisons for each grade level<br/>                     District support personnel</p> <p>The leadership team meets regularly (i.e. bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the Leadership team is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process.</li> <li>2. Support the implementation of high quality instruction and enrichment for the core student body performing on level (Tier 1)</li> <li>3. Supports rigorous instruction to include intervention/enrichment for struggling learners (Tier 2/3).</li> <li>4. Supports instructional staff in their efforts to move from a total focus of remediation to one of acceleration, to help close achievement gaps that exist throughout the district.</li> <li>5. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.</li> <li>6. Communicate school-wide data to school staff through acceptable modes of communication practices</li> <li>7. Coordinate PLC meeting in which the facilitation of problem solving within the content/grade level teams as well as lateral teams can occur.</li> </ol> <p>Responsible for the growth of a collaborative culture in which a shared responsibility for student needs and successes are to flourish.</p> <p>Responsible for the hiring and retention of highly qualified instructional and support personnel.</p> <p>Has successful completed the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline program. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline.</p> <p>Supports HCPS vision in hiring practices for instructional improvement which believes in placing highly effective teachers in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school.</p> |



| Name           | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------|----------------|--|
| Angelo, Nicole | Teacher, K-12  | <p>The job duties and responsibilities for the SAC chair are as listed below:<br/>                     Conduct SAC meetings<br/>                     Collaborate with members of the SAC committee pertaining to the SIP plan and school data<br/>                     Work with administration to discuss school data<br/>                     Coordinate staff votes<br/>                     Finalize SIP plan</p> <p>Additional duties as pertains to Mrs. Angelo include instructional and leadership responsibilities as she is a classroom teacher and a grade level team lead.</p> |

|                 |                     |  |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Cadore, Melanie | Assistant Principal | <p>The assistant principal's job duties and responsibilities consists of the following, but are not limited to what is listed below as the position is always evolving and they evaluate each incident and do what is in the best interest of the student body.</p> <p>Support the principal in all aspects of leadership of the school.<br/>                     Manage standards based and state mandatory testing processes.<br/>                     Facilitate faculty meetings.<br/>                     Support staff members in their instructional practices.</p> |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 3/28/2017, Diane Sanchez

**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.*

6

**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.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

778

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

4

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

6

**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                              | 124         | 118 | 146 | 124 | 124 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 784   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 68          | 75  | 65  | 67  | 57  | 66  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 398   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 6   | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 46  | 29  | 31  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 106   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 37  | 39  | 38  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 114   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 23  | 71  | 51  | 43  | 82  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 270   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 22 | 21 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/29/2022

**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                              | 108         | 118 | 131 | 126 | 121 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 744   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 2           | 36  | 38  | 41  | 22  | 30  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 169   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 1   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| 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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 9   | 33  | 54  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 9   | 41  | 54  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 22  | 67  | 54  | 46  | 91  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 280   |

**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           | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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                              | 108         | 118 | 131 | 126 | 121 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 744   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 2           | 36  | 38  | 41  | 22  | 30  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 169   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 1   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| 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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 9   | 33  | 54  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 9   | 41  | 54  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 22  | 67  | 54  | 46  | 91  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 280   |

**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           | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 18 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 9  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1  |

**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             | 48%    | 53%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 50%    | 52%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 70%    |          |       |        |          |       | 64%    | 55%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 60%    |          |       |        |          |       | 62%    | 50%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 55%    | 50%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 50%    | 54%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 77%    |          |       |        |          |       | 62%    | 57%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 66%    |          |       |        |          |       | 52%    | 46%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 43%    | 59%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 47%    | 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 | 45%    | 52%      | -7%                        | 58%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 55%      | -4%                        | 58%   | -7%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -45%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 49%    | 54%      | -5%                        | 56%   | -7%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -51%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 42%    | 54%      | -12%                       | 62%   | -20%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 57%      | -6%                        | 64%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -42%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 54%      | -6%                        | 60%   | -12%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -51%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 44%    | 51%      | -7%                        | 53%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 16       | 57     | 52          | 37        | 73      | 79           | 15       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 47       | 73     | 64          | 54        | 76      | 58           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 19       | 63     |             | 30        | 68      |              | 10       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 48       | 69     | 57          | 55        | 76      | 63           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 65       | 77     |             | 60        | 92      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 47       | 69     | 60          | 53        | 76      | 64           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 24       | 64     | 77          | 29        | 56      | 57           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 41       | 64     | 71          | 43        | 56      | 46           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 26       |        |             | 16        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 69     | 74          | 44        | 58      | 56           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 80       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 73       |        |             | 59        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 46       | 68     | 71          | 44        | 56      | 54           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 19       | 48     | 49          | 23        | 54      | 46           | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 63     | 67          | 50        | 65      | 59           | 49       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 80       | 92     |             | 80        | 100     |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 43       | 63     |             | 29        | 37      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 48       | 62     | 64          | 50        | 61      | 54           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 55       |        |             | 64        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       | 83     |             | 50        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 63     | 63          | 49        | 61      | 53           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |

**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  | 59   |
| 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 | 54   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 473  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 46   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 58  |
| 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                                | 38  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 58  |
| 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   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| 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   | 74  |
| 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                                | 58 |
| 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?**

Science achievement levels were the lowest of the three content areas tested at 43% proficient.

Grade level data analysis indicates that 4th grade improved in achievement in both ELA and Math percentages.

Subgroup data review indicates that ELL students made positive gains in all measured areas (achievement, learning gains and BQ gains in ELA, Math and Science) with the exception of the bottom quartile for ELA.

Additional subgroup analysis indicates that SWD and BLK students underperformed significantly in both Math and ELA achievement when compared to their peers and the school achievement goals.

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

Based on the state mandated testing data for 2022 the following areas are of the greatest need:

1. The percentage of 5th grade students which earn achievement level on state mandated testing.
2. The percentage of SWD that earn achievement level on state mandated testing in the content areas of Math and ELA.
3. The percentage of BLK students that earn achievement level on state mandated testing in the content areas of Math and ELA.

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

Contributing factors include:

Lack of vocabulary – continue the use of DOK words throughout instruction and planned common learning focuses in content areas as well as the implementation of vocabulary word walls in all instructional classrooms

Math support and math small group instruction – grade level content area planning with math instructional coach. Planning for a focus on small group acceleration and the implementation in the classroom math instruction.



Consistent science instruction – school wide LTI expectations to occur in all science classes as well as daily science instruction to include hands on application.

Student attendance – attendance plan for at risk students coupled with attendance incentives

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

Based off the progress monitoring data which included 2022 state mandated assessments, learning gains for ELA was at 70% which was a 6% increase from the 2021 data.

Math learning gains were at 77% which was a 15% increase from the previous year's testing data.

Overall, Math data showed net positive gains in all areas for the school which include achievement up 10% from 2021 to 55%, learning gains as indicated previously and lowest 25th percentile up 14% to a level of 66% of the tested student body.

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

To improve math performance, the school focused on grade level common planning with a focus on data to drive instruction and small group delivery of instruction to address needs, which included both remediation and acceleration.

To improve student performance in learning gains administration implemented the expectation of goal setting with students. This expectation informs students of their previous testing performance and had them set goals to achieve gains, thus making both the student and teacher accountable for the student gains performance.

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

The strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning in ELA are as follows:

1. Small group instruction
2. Interventions for students based on data analysis and needs assessments
3. Individual conferencing in the content area of writing
4. Instructional planning based on data driven decisions
5. Informal assessments to be conducted by instructional staff
6. The use of IREADY remedial lessons/toolbox lessons

The strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning in math are as follows:

1. Small group instruction
2. Interventions for students based on data analysis and needs assessments
3. Instructional planning based on data driven decisions
4. Informal assessments to be conducted by instructional staff
5. Instructional planning support from the school level math coach

The strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning in science are as follows:

1. Consistent daily instruction to include STEM education
2. Use of FSSA review and practice guides
3. Small group instruction
4. Interventions for students based on data analysis and needs assessments
5. The use of student goal setting to evaluate student yearly growth
6. Instructional planning based on data driven decisions

7. School wide usage of long term investigations
8. Informal assessments to be conducted by instructional staff

**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 opportunities provide instructional and non instructional staff techniques to aid in the improvement of student performance.

All staff members were required to participate in professional study day during preplanning. PSD focused upon B.E.S.T. standards understanding and implementation for ELA and Math instruction. In addition, content coaches will collaborate with classroom teachers in the development and delivery of coaching cycles.

Literacy leaders are to attend RAISE and other district trainings pertaining to student growth in the area of reading and writing.

Vertical PLCs will be done to discuss data needs that expand beyond one's grade level and help build foundation needs in all content areas.

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

Vertical PLCs - a team of educators from adjoining grade levels which discuss how standards, curriculum, assessment, and instruction align within the school.  
The group actively participate in a collaboration session to create a plan which is developed to address needs trends.

Content coaching cycles - consists of four components: goal setting, planning, observation, and reflection. Each step is done collaboratively between the teacher and the coach.

Math coach - supports planning practices among the grade levels and supports small group instruction

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

All teachers are planning in weekly planning sessions and PLCs focusing on intentional small group instruction. Students are actively engaged in intentional and DEEP differentiated small groups on a regular basis. Teachers were planning for content area on a weekly basis yet had difficulty planning for small groups consistently due to lack of time and support.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific**

**measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.**

**This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

8% of students will decrease from tier 3 (two or more grade levels below) to tier 2 (one grade level below) as measured with the growth from PM1 given in August / September 2022 to PM3 given in April / May of 2023.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration, Coaches and Team leads will monitor teacher weekly planning sessions. Administration, Coaches and Team leads will monitor small group planning with acceleration weekly. Goal setting is happening with every student in math and reading classes, this is monitored by teachers using a self-selected data tracker.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Research based strategies will be used to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Such as standards based planning, data-driven differentiated professional development, goal setting, genuine discussions that reveal student understanding of learning outcomes.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

When teachers have clear high quality instruction and rigorous understanding of the standards, this will ensure increased 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. Implement standards based instruction incorporating foundational skills and assessment of learning target.
2. Utilize data to develop rigorous differentiated opportunities for students to engage in high level of learning.

Guidelines used include but are not limited to the following:

- a) teachers will know which standard to focus on, bring materials, bring resources to share,
- b) emphasis on content area vocabulary instruction through visuals, interactive, or concrete experiences
- c) explicit teaching of foundational skills through skill based mini lessons daily/weekly
- d) utilize a variety of formal and informal data points for weekly planning and instruction

- e) gather formal or/and informal assessment data throughout lessons
- f) establish routines and structures for higher order questioning to monitor student understanding
- g) students demonstrate understanding of learning outcomes through discussion and products
- h) differentiated instruction incorporating learning modalities and fluid data based grouping
- i) differentiated professional development according to school and grade level needs

**Person Responsible**        Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

### Area of Focus Description

#### and Rationale:

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

Students are working on intentional appropriately rigorous grade level content and learning activities with monitoring techniques that are completely aligned to the B.E.S.T. benchmarks. Second through fifth grade teachers need to focus on acceleration instead of remediation.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall grades 3, 4, and 5 had 48% of the student body earning achievement level for ELA on state testing in 2022. This will increase by 5% to 53% using the growth measurement from PM1 given in August / September 2022 to PM3 given in April / May of 2023.

#### Monitoring:

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

Through data chats and ongoing monitoring through beginning, middle and end of the year state assessments, i-Ready data analysis, district created progress monitoring assessments (PMA) in all applicable subject areas, and in addition teachers and coaches will monitor student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

#### Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Research based strategies will be used to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Such as B.E.S.T. standards based planning, data-driven differentiated professional development, goal setting, genuine discussions that reveal student understanding of learning outcomes.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

When teachers have clear high quality instruction and rigorous understanding of the standards, this will ensure increased 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. Implement B.E.S.T. standards instruction, incorporating foundational skills and assessment of learning target.
2. Utilize data to develop rigorous differentiated opportunities for students to engage in rigorous instruction.

#### Guidelines:

- a) teachers to know the standard of focus, bring materials and resources to share
- b) emphasis on content area vocabulary instruction through visuals/interaction/experience
- c) teaching of foundational skills
- d) utilize data points to guide weekly planning/instruction
- e) gather formal or/and informal assessment data throughout lessons
- f) establish routines and structures for H.O.T. questions
- g) students demonstrate understanding of learning through discussion/production
- h) differentiated instruction incorporating learning modalities and fluid data based grouping
- i) include culturally responsive curricula to address minority needs

- j) differentiated professional development based on needs
- k) focused instruction on mental health to improve student self esteem
- l) focused male mentor group sessions

Resources:

DOK chart

STEMScopes online resources

Mathematical Thinking and Resource Standards

B.E.S.T. standards

**Person Responsible**

Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

Based on the 2022 data, students will increase their daily attendance from 67% to 85%. The administration, student support and instructional staff will encourage school attendance using daily, weekly, monthly, 9 week and yearly incentives. Grade levels will compete to promote attendance with incentives to be budgeted through Title One funding.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

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

The school attendance rate will increase 5% each quarter when compared to the previous school's year's correlating grading quarter.

**Monitoring:**

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

Instructional staff will follow up with families after three absences and work with student support team after a child as accrued 8 to 10 absences. The clerical staff will field phone calls from families and the school will mail letters to report 10 unexcused absences. The student support staff will work with the staff to educate and collaborate on how to help the families improve their student attendance rate. The administration and student support staff will oversee the process to assure accuracy and accountability.

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Research based strategies will be used to improve the quality student attendance. Such as attendance incentives, goal setting, family engagement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Family engagement in the school promotes a positive culture, which improves attendance rates. Absenteeism reality is a problem as early as kindergarten and preschool. In addition, missing just two days a month can cause a student to fall behind academically.

**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 staff will follow up with families after three absences
2. Instructional staff will work with student support team after a child has accrued 8 to 10 absences.
3. The clerical staff will field phone calls from families and the school will mail letters to report 10 unexcused absences.
4. The student support personnel will work with the staff to educate and collaborate on how to help our families improve their student attendance rate.
5. The student support staff will work with at risk families on strategies to improve absenteeism.

**Person**

Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

**Responsible****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 the 2022 progress monitoring data and additional risk factor data, there are 6 children that are indicated to be at risk for non achievement performance on ELA state mandated testing once they are in grade 3. This equates to 1% of our student population.

Other forms of data that will be considered will be PMA assessments in core content areas, district form data, and small group data analysis.

In grade levels K through 2nd, instructional practices specifically related to ELA will include the following:

1. small group reading instruction
2. whole group foundational skill instruction using support curricula



3. focus upon fluency strategies to enhance reading practices
4. grade level planning with instructional coaches focusing on data driven decision making for planning/ instruction and engagement

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

Based on the 2022 stated mandated testing results 59% of students in grade 3 scored a level 2 or lower on the ELA portion of FSA.

Other forms of data that will be considered will be PMA assessments in core content areas, district form data, and small group data analysis.

In grade levels 3rd through 5th, instructional practices specifically related ELA will include the following:

1. small group reading instruction
2. whole group foundational skills instruction using support curricula
3. focus upon fluency strategies to enhance reading practices
4. grade level planning with instructional coaches focusing on data driven decision making for planning/ instruction and engagement

### **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)**

8% of students will decrease from below level performance to achievement level performance measured with the growth from PM1 given in August / September 2022 to PM3 given in April / May of 2023.

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

8% of students will decrease from below level performance to achievement level performance measured with the growth from PM1 given in August / September 2022 to PM3 given in April / May of 2023.

### **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.

Administration, Coaches and Team leads will monitor teacher weekly planning sessions. Administration, Coaches and Team leads will monitor small group planning with acceleration weekly. Goal setting is happening with every student in math and reading classes, this is monitored by teachers using a self-selected data tracker.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sanchez, Diane, diane.sanchez1@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?

Evidenced based practices to improve literacy performance will include the following:

1. small group instruction
2. engagement practice

Small-group learning is a method that can supplement varied formats of instruction. Students work together in groups of typically 3-6 members, helping each other think critically, master course concepts, and apply them to real-world situations.

With small groups students develop deeper understanding of the material being presented. Students tend to retain more information and for longer periods time when it is delivered in a small-group learning atmosphere verses other forms of instructional practices. In addition there is a correlations to improvement in attendance, efficiency, and persistence with the use of small group practices.

Engagement practices attract students to their work, help in persistence of task, despite obstacles, and provides a sense of accomplishment for a job well done.

**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 rationale for engagement and small group practices:

1. Academic:

- a) Students are better at solving problems and develop a deeper understanding of the material when working in groups.
- b) Students learn more and retain material longer.
- c) Attendance, efficiency, and persistence improves.

2. Social:

- a) Students develop social and leadership skills.
- b) Students who process information and work together on a problem in groups are also more committed to staying in school and are more likely to integrate across different ethnic, cultural, language, class, ability, and gender groups.

3. Psychological:

- a) Small-group learning helps draw people out who normally would not participate in front of the whole class.
- b) It also promotes self-esteem as compared to competitive or individualistic learning.

4. Persistence:

- a) Attract students to their work.
- b) Helps in persistence of work, despite obstacles
- c) Provides a sense of accomplishment

**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                  |
|--|--|
| <p>Step one of the action plan for implementation of ELA instruction involves our school's literacy leaders.</p> <p>Literacy leaders will attend Hillsborough County provided and/or approved trainings, which supports RAISE initiatives in instruction for struggling readers.</p> <p>Additionally, coaches will attend monthly meetings which support data analysis, curricula, and implementation of B.E.S.T. standards in the ELA classrooms.</p> | <p>Sanchez, Diane,<br/>diane.sanchez1@hcps.net</p> |
| <p>Literacy leaders will bring training information, data, and coaching strategies back to the school and share with grade levels during team planning sessions.</p>   | <p>Sanchez, Diane,<br/>diane.sanchez1@hcps.net</p> |
| <p>Differentiated small group instruction will be planned for during collaboration sessions with coaches and implemented with fidelity during instructional time set aside for small groups.</p>   | <p>Sanchez, Diane,<br/>diane.sanchez1@hcps.net</p> |
| <p>Progress monitoring will occur using district PMAs and FAST form assessments. Analysis of this data will be used to inform future planning sessions and instruction.</p>  | <p>Sanchez, Diane,<br/>diane.sanchez1@hcps.net</p> |

## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school's focus on positive culture and climate is centered around parental involvement. Parent engagement in a child's school has long been heralded as an important and positive variable on a child's academic and socioemotional development.

To support parent engagement, the school host the following events:

1. grade levels will hold face to face meetings for expectations and conferences
2. Heritage Family Night
3. Parental invitation to award ceremonies
4. PTA sponsored Carnival
5. STEM family night

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

PTA committee to host parent events

Grade level representatives to host family and face to face conferences

ESOL department to host Heritage Family Night

Science committee to host STEM family nights and at home STEM challenges