

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Davis 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 |

Davis Elementary School

10907 MEMORIAL HWY, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Patrick Lalone

Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2012

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) |
| 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 |

Davis Elementary School

10907 MEMORIAL HWY, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 92% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will provide opportunities for students to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to ensure a standard of excellence in developing each student, academically, emotionally and socially.

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| LaLone, Patrick | Principal | Ensure the goals and activities of this SIP are conveyed to parents, staff and community. To ensure the implementation of all activities. |
| Wilsey, Adriana | Assistant Principal | Ensure the goals and activities of this SIP are conveyed to parents, staff and community. To ensure the implementation of all activities. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 9/1/2012, Patrick Lalone

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

570

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

5

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 84 | 67 | 73 | 104 | 78 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 490 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 36 | 21 | 46 | 24 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 26 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 39 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4 | 8 | 10 | 22 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/28/2022

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 | 60 | 76 | 96 | 83 | 85 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 497 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 18 | 32 | 20 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| 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 | 34 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 35 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| 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 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 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 | 60 | 76 | 96 | 83 | 85 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 497 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 18 | 32 | 20 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| 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 | 34 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 35 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| 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 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 43% | 53% | 56% | | | | 49% | 52% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58% | | | | | | 57% | 55% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | | | | | | 48% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 52% | 50% | 50% | | | | 48% | 54% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 66% | | | | | | 54% | 57% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | | | | | | 29% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 43% | 59% | 59% | | | | 48% | 50% | 53% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 52% | 0% | 58% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 55% | -4% | 58% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 41% | 54% | -13% | 56% | -15% |
| 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 | 45% | 54% | -9% | 62% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 57% | -17% | 64% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -45% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 54% | -3% | 60% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 51% | -6% | 53% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 20 | 37 | 38 | 26 | 42 | 37 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 56 | 48 | 50 | 67 | 63 | 35 | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 58 | 47 | 49 | 65 | 59 | 42 | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 60 | | 61 | 67 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 58 | 49 | 52 | 67 | 62 | 41 | | | | |

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 12 | 17 | 9 | 24 | 42 | 30 | 22 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 54 | | 36 | 37 | 40 | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | | | 27 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 43 | 30 | 38 | 39 | 44 | 30 | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | | | 68 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 35 | 28 | 40 | 43 | 47 | 25 | | | | |
| 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 | 27 | 42 | 38 | 27 | 38 | 23 | 24 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 54 | 53 | 41 | 54 | 37 | 39 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 46 | | 40 | 48 | | 27 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 58 | 49 | 45 | 49 | 33 | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 58 | 54 | 60 | 69 | | 65 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 57 | 47 | 47 | 52 | 31 | 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 | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 60 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 427 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 52 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 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 | 54 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 53 |
| 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 | 63 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 54 |
| 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?

Learning gains in both ELA and Math increased. Students with Disabilities' Learning Gains were significantly below the gains of other student sub-groups. Reading, Math and Science proficiency increased in grades 3-5 based on FSA data.

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

Proficiency in Math and ELA for students with disabilities. ELA proficiency for all students. Science proficiency for all students. ELA Bottom Quartile.

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

Students with disabilities were still feeling the impact of eLearning and missed instructional time from the COVID pandemic. The inability for our ESE teachers to consistently provide effective academic interventions for the students. Planning was not consistent through all grade levels. ESE teachers will need to provide specific differentiated and scaffolded support to students with disabilities. Improved planning for BEST standards instruction by all grade levels to increase student understanding.

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

We improved in every measured area on state assessments used for school grade.

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

The teachers were able to make up for the lost instruction from the previous school year. Teachers assessed student needs and provided differentiated instruction during the year.

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

Effective small group instructional practices will need to be implemented in all grade levels.

Continuous data analysis will target the areas for acceleration.

Lessons will need to be student led with opportunities for productive struggle.

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.

District academic coaches will provide PD on effective strategies to utilize during small group instruction.

School based academic coaches will provide mini workshops on effective strategies to develop teacher pedagogy: High order questioning, student led discussions, productive struggle/rigor.

State support in ELA by a State Regional Literacy Director.

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

Instructional Learning Team (ILT) will meet monthly to discuss feedback from district walk throughs and develop strategies and PD to implement suggested best practices.

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 Differentiation**Area of Focus Description****and Rationale:**

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

We will use data based decision making to drive instructional practices. This will be done through formative assessments within lessons.

The rationale is based on the the following data: students in the ELA Bottom Quartile made 45% gains and the Students with Disabilities sub-group are under the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome:**State the specific**

measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data

based, objective outcome.

Students in the bottom quartile and the targeted subgroup (Students With Disabilities) will make a 10% gain in proficiency and learning gains

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by informal and formal classroom walkthroughs by school administration, school based academic coaches, and district academic coaches. Progress Monitoring Data will also be monitored throughout the year with a focus on the bottom quartile and targeted subgroups

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will use formative assessments and scaffolding strategies within their lessons to drive instructional practices and accelerate learning. Professional development will be provided to teachers based on current best practices and evidence-based strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Formative assessment is a planned process in which assessment-elicited evidence of students' status is used by teachers to adjust their ongoing instructional procedures or by students to adjust their current learning tactics. There are many research studies that support the use of Formative assessments to improve student achievement.

Evidence based research can be found in the following article: Klute, M., Apthorp, H., Harlacher, J., & Reale, M. (2017). Formative assessment and elementary school student academic achievement: A review of the evidence (REL 2017–259). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

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.

Provide Professional Development on utilizing formative assessments during lessons and using the results to provide differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible

Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Teachers will participate in planning sessions with state Regional Literacy Director and academic coaches to develop effective formative assessments and to plan instructional strategies based on the data.

Person Responsible

Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Leadership Team will analyze the students in the bottom quartile monthly to ensure that they are receiving additional support in the classroom.

Person Responsible Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Teachers will implement effective small group instruction. after they plan with district and school-based academic coaches.

Person Responsible Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the final iReady Diagnostic in Spring 2022, 31% of K-2 students scored "Mid-Year, Late-Year and Above" in Reading, Teachers spent a great deal of time learning the new standards and curriculum resources, which observation data show had a positive impact on whole group, or shared, instruction. Deeper planning for small group rotations and individual student needs is needed. Teachers will plan each 6 week unit as a team, then reflect and plan on a weekly basis toward mastery of daily objectives and targeted small group rotations with consideration of our teacher and student priority look-fors. Administration and content coaches will participate in weekly planning.

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

According to 2022 FSA in Reading, 43% of 3rd-5th graders scored a level 3 or higher. With new standards and curriculum resources in 3-5, we will increase teacher clarity around new BEST standards for ELA in 3-5 through weekly collaborative planning sessions. These sessions will begin with planning for the 6 week unit, and then working through each week by reviewing student data and needs to inform instruction. Administration and content coaching will participate in weekly planning.

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)

Based on iReady Final Diagnostic AND FAST Data, 50% of K-2 students will score ON LEVEL.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on iReady Final Diagnostic AND FAST Data, 50% of 3-5 students will score ON LEVEL.

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.

Through the Leadership Team (administration and content coaches) and Instructional Leadership Team (teacher leaders), walkthrough trends and student data will be systematically analyzed on a weekly basis, with adjustments to instruction and groupings made as needed. Data analysis is scheduled out based on the following assessment calendar: iReady Diagnostic 1 (all teachers have chosen to give diagnostic), checkpoints, unit assessments, FAST assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

LaLone, Patrick, patrick.lalone@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

Collaborative standards aligned planning with a focus on teacher and student clarity is recognized in John Hattie's work, Visible Learning, as a research based best practice.

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?

Feedback and student data from similar schools in the district demonstrate this practice is effective. Additionally, prior data in student learning gains indicate success.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Literacy coaching through collaborative planning and walkthrough feedback cycles will be implemented on a weekly basis. | LaLone, Patrick, patrick.lalone@hcps.net |

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Davis Elementary builds positive relations with parents through ongoing communication in both English and Spanish. We will hold several events throughout the year that provide support for parents with their child's learning and also to recognize their child's accomplishments.

Davis Elementary actively pursues business partnerships within our community. After we have established partnerships within our community, we have our partners serve on our School Advisory Council and PTA. Our community partners also mentor students and provide incentives for students and staff.

We have a school-wide behavior program - PBIS. This program is infused throughout the school and enables students to be recognized and rewarded for positive school behavior and ensuring we have a supportive school culture.

We have a positive referral program "Deserving Dragons" where teachers recognize students for being a positive role model. The students are recognized in the office and their parents are called.

We have monthly "Student of the Month" breakfasts where a student from each classroom is selected for positively demonstrating the character trait of the month. Parents are invited to the breakfast.

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

Principal and Assistant Principal monitor the school culture and environment throughout the year. This is done by analyzing behavior data, staff and student SEL questionnaires, parent input.

RTI Specialist runs and maintains the schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions Supports (PBIS) program.

School Counselor runs the "Student of the Month" program. They also provide Social Emotional Learning support throughout the year. This is done through individual counseling and classroom lessons.

School Social Worker and School Psychologist also provide individualized counseling as needed throughout the school year.