
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

Frost Elementary School

3950 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Temeka Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (60%)
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

Frost Elementary School

3950 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We are committed to prepare individual learners for success in life with a positive, student-centered community that supports high expectations for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing lasting imprints for lifelong learning.

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
Mikell, Tiffany	Principal	Responsible for full operations and achievement of Frost Elementary School. Provides strategic direction to the school, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent and community involvement, revising policies and procedures, administering the budget, hiring and evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.
Lewis, Temeka	Assistant Principal	Providing strategic direction to the school, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent and community involvement, revising policies and procedures, evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/31/2022, Temeka Lewis

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.*

48

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

575

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

8

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

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	91	95	94	85	76	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	3	23	24	15	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	19	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	21	21	21	19	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	2	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	4	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/31/2022

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	94	89	96	83	79	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	30	25	25	27	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	29	30	20	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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	0	1	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	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	94	89	96	83	79	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	30	25	25	27	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	29	30	20	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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	0	1	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	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	46%	53%	56%				55%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						55%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						49%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	50%	50%				54%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						59%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						57%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	59%	59%				46%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

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	54%	54%	0%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

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	4	11	18	14	43						
ELL	39	50		52	63		58				
BLK	37	53	42	40	50	40	27				
HSP	44	43	36	45	51	64	47				
MUL	53	60		73	70						
WHT	64	42		52	64						
FRL	40	50	38	44	54	50	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	25			30							
ELL	41	57		33	44		18				
BLK	39	38		34	28	30	21				
HSP	41	58		35	46		28				
MUL	71			73							
WHT	61			57							
FRL	40	44	64	39	36	36	24				
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	47	52	40	47	38	17					
ELL	39	42		42	58	60					
BLK	49	58	47	46	59	61	38				
HSP	54	57	58	55	57	53	50				
MUL	73	60		55	50						
WHT	68	44		73	64		50				
FRL	50	54	45	49	58	56	38				

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	48
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	41
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	49
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
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	47
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?

In 2021, students in the bottom quartile made ELA learning gains of 60%, and in 2022, students in the bottom quartile made ELA learning gains of 37%. This is a decrease of 23% in the bottom quartile for learning gains in ELA.

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

The data component showing the greatest area of need is the ELA bottom quartile and ELA proficiency. When analyzing school comparison data, school ELA proficiency was 46%, and school ELA bottom quartile was 37%.

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

Possible contributing factors included the lack of resources specific to the standards throughout the grade levels. There was a possible lack of adequate progress monitoring that was inconsistently analyzed to support deficiencies.

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

The data component showing the greatest area of improvement is Math bottom quartile learning gains, with a 19% gain. In 2021, Math bottom quartile proficiency was 33%, and in 2022, the Math bottom quartile proficiency was 52%.

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

PLC planning was consistent and data analysis was completed with fidelity.

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

K-5 teachers will utilize Wonders curriculum, which implements the BEST standards, when planning instruction.

Teachers will plan with a sight-based reading coach.

Planning will place emphasis on whole group and small group instruction.

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.

The reading coach will attend all planning meetings.

Utilize monthly PD on Monday afternoons based on the data.

Coaching support.

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

Non-evaluative walkthroughs by coaches and administration.

Planning meetings to analyze data with fidelity.

Grade level team meetings with coaches and administration, focusing on current data trends.

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 ELA

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 2021-22 FSA data, we were below 50% proficiency in ELA.

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

Students proficiency will be at least 50% in reading based on the 2022-23 FAST by the end of the school year.

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

Based on FAST and iReady diagnostic that is taken three times a year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Mikell (tiffany.mikell@hcps.net)

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

Standards-based planning with the reading coach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Standards-based instructional planning will give the teachers the necessary skills and tools necessary to challenge students and unlock their potential.

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.

Standards-based instructional planning

*Teachers will participate in grade level/subject area planning sessions with reading coach, and RTI coach. Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Microsoft Teams.

VE/ESE, ESOL Resource Teacher will participate in grade level planning sessions to ensure SWD and ELL students are engaged in grade level content. Planning templates will be made available for all VE/ ESE teachers as well as ELL paras in order to align their work with these subgroups.

Through planning, the reading coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support FRL students in order to increase achievement.

RTI resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group.

Teachers will participate in sight-based BEST standards professional development monthly with the reading coach, and district professional development trainings.

Person Responsible

Tiffany Mikell (tiffany.mikell@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

Standards-based instructional planning

*Teachers will participate in grade level/subject area planning sessions with reading coach, and RTI coach. Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Microsoft Teams.

VE/ESE, ESOL Resource Teacher will participate in grade level planning sessions weekly to ensure SWD and ELL students are engaged in grade level content. Planning templates will be made available for all VE/ESE teachers as well as ELL paras in order to align their work with these subgroups.

Through planning, the reading coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support FRL students in order to increase achievement.

RTI resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group.

Teachers will participate in sight-based BEST standards professional development monthly with the reading coach, and district professional development trainings.

Planning for small group instruction and implementation will take place during sight-based planning sessions.

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

Standards-based instructional planning

*Teachers will participate in grade level/subject area planning sessions with reading coach, and RTI coach. Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Microsoft Teams.

VE/ESE, ESOL Resource Teacher will participate in grade level planning sessions to ensure SWD and ELL students are engaged in grade level content. Planning templates will be made available for all VE/ESE teachers as well as ELL paras in order to align their work with these subgroups.

Through planning, the reading coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support FRL students in order to increase achievement.

RTI resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group.

Teachers will participate in sight-based BEST standards professional development monthly with the reading coach, and district professional development trainings.

Planning for small group instruction and implementation will take place during sight-based planning sessions.

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)

Students proficiency will be at least 50% in reading based on the 2022-23 FAST by the end of the school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students proficiency will be at least 50% in reading based on the 2022-23 FAST by the end of the school year.

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.

Based on FAST and iReady diagnostic that is taken three times a year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mikell, Tiffaney, tiffaney.mikell@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?

K-5 teachers will utilize Wonders curriculum, which implements the BEST standards, when planning instruction.

Teachers will plan with a sight-based reading coach.

Planning will place emphasis on whole group and small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

Wonders curriculum utilizing the BEST standards, gives teachers the necessary skills and tools necessary to challenge students and unlock their potential.

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>Literacy Leadership Standards-based instructional planning *Teachers will participate in grade level/subject area planning sessions with reading coach, and RTI coach. Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Microsoft Teams. VE/ESE, ESOL Resource Teacher will participate in grade level planning sessions weekly to ensure SWD and ELL students are engaged in grade level content. Planning templates will be made available for all VE/ESE teachers as well as ELL paras in order to align their work with these subgroups.</p>	<p>Mikell, Tiffany, tiffany.mikell@hcps.net</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching Through planning, the reading coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support FRL students in order to increase achievement. RTI resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group.</p>	
<p>Professional Learning Teachers will participate in sight-based BEST standards professional development monthly with the reading coach, and district professional development trainings. Planning for small group instruction and implementation will take place during sight-based planning sessions.</p>	<p>Mikell, Tiffany, tiffany.mikell@hcps.net</p>
<p>Assessment The FAST and iReady diagnostic that is taken three times a year.</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.

Effective communication is essential for building school-family partnerships. It constitutes the foundation for all other forms of family involvement in education. We work to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. School staff, students, parents, and community, work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home newsletters and flyers, making parent link calls, and posting everything on our website and social media platforms. Parents are invited to join SAC and PTA. Each committee meets monthly to discuss budget, events, and student needs.

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

Business partners that provide incentives for both students and teachers.
Parents that participate in school wide family events.