Dunbar Elementary Magnet School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dunbar Elementary Magnet School

1730 W UNION ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Crim

Start Date for this Principal: 6/7/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: D (34%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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

Dunbar Elementary Magnet School

1730 W UNION ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[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 KG-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		D	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To inspire students to be lifelong learners through authentic learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing each child with a prescription for SUCCESS.

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
Crim, Cynthia	Principal	
Quintyne, Alexandra	Magnet Coordinator	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 6/7/2020, Cynthia Crim

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.*
0

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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
16

Total number of students enrolled at the school
318

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.
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	30	32	50	54	46	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	14	15	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	31	31	49	53	47	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
Attendance below 90 percent	9	8	14	12	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	33	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	29	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	31	31	49	53	47	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
Attendance below 90 percent	9	8	14	12	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	33	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	29	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	42%	53%	56%				43%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						39%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						33%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	59%	50%	50%				53%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						26%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						11%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	59%	59%				30%	50%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	29%	51%	-22%	53%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	33		36	73		18				
ELL	43			50							
BLK	34	42	63	52	56	67	26				
HSP	51	57		68	61		63				
MUL	62			69							
WHT	40	36		60	55						
FRL	38	45	58	57	59	61	35				

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	35	55		39	45						
ELL	40			47							
BLK	33	58	50	51	45		30				
HSP	58	62		64	46		73				
MUL	50			60							
FRL	41	62	46	56	48	54	47				

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	11	13	15	18	17	13					
ELL	29	33		50	22						
BLK	36	33	29	51	26	17	25				
HSP	43	36		55	33		23				
MUL	50			30							
WHT	81	60		75	30						
FRL	40	38	33	51	27	11	23				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	47
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	49
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	60
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
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	50
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?

When analyzing FSA data, our students in the bottom quartile showed significant gains in both reading and math.

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

Based on our PM data, our two greatest areas of improvement are Reading and Science

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

Now that we have a solid foundation with core instruction, we are looking to build our overall proficiency within all core subject areas.

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

Our Math data showed the most improvement.

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

We implemented intentional planning around the standards and wrote lessons according to the content limits.

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

We are continuing to pull students into small groups based on our observations from pre-assessments, monthly assessments and iready data. We re-teach data when it is a natural fit within the current grade-level appropriate standards.

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.

We have been centering our learning are Data Driven Instruction and Aggressive Monitoring our students. Our teachers will visit model classrooms in a nearby school who have implemented DDI. Once they've visited the other school, we will set up model classrooms on our campus for teachers to observe the aggressive monitoring practices and data chats.

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

The support provided to our students and teachers is provided by our site-based leadership team. We've put a strong plan in place for common planning with each grade level, data chats for each assessment and targeted small groups of students being pulled 4 days a week for additional support in both reading and math.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Instructional Priority: Create and implement lessons which utilize high leverage instructional practices aligned to our B.E.S.T. standards. When analyzing our data from last year we determined our deficits were based on the following areas of greatest need: 1. Lack of understanding of the new BEST standards for Reading and Math and new implementation of all the standards at once. 2. All grade levels in Reading and Math, as well as our ESSA subgroups are not at 55% proficient, based on iready and/or district assessments. 3. Planning for individual needs of students
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By August, 100% of our teachers will be engaged in planning with content coaches, utilizing our new BEST standards. By September 2022, 100% of teachers will be trained in the new BEST Standards for both reading and math. By October 2022, 100% of teachers will implement on grade level, standards-aligned instruction within small groups in ELA and when appropriate in math. By December 2022, 100% of teachers will utilize Achievement Level Descriptors (if available by DOE with new standards) (grades 3-5) to differentiate within independent work and small group instruction. This will be monitored through the collection of data using site-based walk-through form (school look-fors). Based on the end of year state and/or district assessment the percent of students scoring a level 3 or higher will improve to 55% in all subjects. The overall learning gains and bottom quartile gains for reading and math will increase to 55%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Administration and instructional coaches will meet weekly and ILT (every 8 weeks) to discuss progress towards our goals. As a leadership team and ILT we will utilize the look-fors developed during preplanning to ensure consistency and fidelity of the implementation of our instructional priority.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1) Teachers will use data from assessments and aggressive monitoring to scaffold instruction 2)Teachers will utilize small group instruction to fill instructional gaps through differentiation and acceleration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	John Hatties research shows the effectiveness factor of small group instruction (.47) and differentiation/RTI (1.29). With the effectiveness hinge point being .40, these two focus points will increase student achievement for ALL students.

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.

The Reading Coach will focus on coaching, modeling, lesson planning, and pulling small groups. The coach will meet with all ELA teachers weekly to plan for standards-aligned instruction. During planning, the coach and teachers will plan by utilizing a variety of tools, including the ALDs to differentiate instruction for each small group. They will utilize current standards data to plan for enrichment or to fill instructional gaps. This will happen weekly and will be under the supervision of the school principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor the implementation of the coaching positions.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

The Math Coach will focus on coaching, modeling, lesson planning, and pulling small groups. The coach will meet with all math teachers weekly to plan for standards-aligned instruction. During planning, the coach and teachers will analyze current and past data to determine an appropriate entry point for each lesson to ensure student success. They will also use current data and/or ALDs to plan for enrichment or to fill instructional gaps. This will happen weekly and will be under the supervision of the school principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor the implementation of the coaching positions.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

The magnet lead will be in charge of marketing and enrollment of all new students. The lead teacher will plan with teachers on a weekly basis to imbed our medical theme. The Magnet lead teacher will attend all magnet events for the district, create marketing materials, be in charge of our communication with community stakeholders and provide tours to potential families and business partners. The magnet lead teacher will be our science contact. While being the science contact, she will plan with teachers for standards-based science instruction and pull small groups based off science data. The magnet lead will plan school-wide events to include families and community members.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

During Pre-Planning, all instructional staff will work together to develop look-fors derived from our Four Principles of Excellent Instruction. When highlighting our focus look-fors, we will develop a consensus of what they "look like" and "sound like". Teachers will work with our coaches to implement these strategies. We will utilize the ILT cycle and move through the Plan, Do, Check and Act stages to ensure successful implementation. These look-fors will be used to monitor progress of our SIP goal.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

During preplanning, we will conduct a training for all teachers for the BEST standards in both reading and math.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

Grade levels will meet for vertical planning to ensure grade-level gaps in learning and/or standards will be addressed in other components of the instructional day, outside of core instruction.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

During Pre-planning teachers will be refreshed in our previous year's work around Data Driven Instruction. As a school we will develop a common system for analyzing student work, creating action plans for reteaching and checking for understanding within our daily lessons.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

Provide professional development for teachers to observe each other through site-based learning walks. These mini PD sessions will be centered around observing practices related to implementation of BEST Standards, small group instruction, data driven instruction and aggressive monitoring. PD will be ongoing throughout the year, taking place a minimum of once per quarter for both reading and math. Implementation will be monitored by school principal.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

Administration and instructional coaches will hold data chats with teachers after each Math and ELA Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA). During data chats, we will compare overall proficiency and proficiency by standard. We will utilize this data to inform our planning sessions, each small group's instructional focus, opportunities for acceleration and to monitor growth of all students.

Teachers will then hold data chats with students to share strengths and opportunities of growth following PMAs.

| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net) |

Create protocols for planning and PLCs to ensure time is set aside to plan for specific times within a lesson for the teacher to employ checks for understanding in all subjects.

| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net) |

Purchase supplies for highly engaging and standards based lessons. Supplies needed include copy paper, student consumable supplies, toner, folders, headphones for laptops, pencil sharpeners, metal file folder holders used for holding laptops, colored paper, markers, labels, ziplock bags, etc…

| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net) |

Create a master schedule to include opportunities for teachers to meet with coaches, utilize planning resources and create engaging lessons for students. Planning sessions will take place weekly and monitored by school principal

| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net) |

Purchase updated technology to make standards-based lessons engaging for all students. Technology will include, but not be limited to interactive displays, document cameras, printers and projectors.

| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@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 iready data students in K- 2 need more explicit instruction in foundational skills to ensure students are reading on level by the time they leave their assigned grade. Instruction in phonics will be improved through small group and explicit instruction.

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

Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 39% in grade 3rd grade and 43% in 4th grade scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to students not leaving the primary grades reading on level and having large gaps to fill in intermediate grades. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include aggressive monitoring with feedback and acceleration, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on FSA.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of students scoring in the proficient range will increase to a minimum of 50% as measured by the end of year STAR assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of 3rd and 4th grade students scoring at (a) 3 or higher on FSAT will increase to 50% as measured by May 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.

This area of focus will be monitored through planning sessions, and implementation of the plans. Both the principal and assistant principal will monitor implementation in classrooms and provide feedback to teachers.

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

Crim, Cynthia, cynthia.crim@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?

Develop & implement student success criteria, accountability, and feedback practices in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement.

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

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

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

In 2022, the data showed that students were successful during the "I do, and we do" portions of gradual release but really struggled with independent practice. The improvement strategy of providing success criteria and feedback will allow teachers to aggressively monitor student understanding, resulting in knowing how to accelerate learning in small groups which will lead to improved student academic performance in ELA.

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
The reading coach will develop and implement professional development for primary teachers around a strong ELA instructional block, and how phonics is embedded within the block. This action step will be monitored by our principal.	Crim, Cynthia, cynthia.crim@hcps.net
Our leadership team will meet weekly to discuss trends in literacy walkthrough data to determine next steps and areas for coaching. This will be monitored weekly through our principal.	Crim, Cynthia, cynthia.crim@hcps.net
Utilize actual student tasks from weekly lesson plans as a guide to create student exemplars and success criteria.	Crim, Cynthia, cynthia.crim@hcps.net
Conduct focused walk throughs in grades 3-5, providing feedback to teachers on use of success criteria, equitable feedback, and student engagement.	Crim, Cynthia, cynthia.crim@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.

Use the following research-based programs to ensure a positive school culture exists on campus: We utilize the HOUSE system and students earn points towards their house for following PULSE.
Utilize the SAC Team ensure equity among all stakeholders' voices in the decision making process..

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

PBIS, CHAMPS, and Restorative Practices will be supported by the Students Services Team and implemented by the teachers.
SAC Team as Equity Team - SAC Chairperson, Admin, and SAC Team Members