Gibsonton Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gibsonton Elementary School

7723 GIBSONTON DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Bree Beitelschies

Start Date for this Principal: 4/10/2017

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 (49%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (38%)
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

Gibsonton Elementary School

7723 GIBSONTON DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[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	74%

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.

To empower all Gibsonton Elementary stakeholders to be global life long learners through high quality academically individualized instruction while instilling core values.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Rise above challenges and strive 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
Guy, Cindy	Principal	
Feaster, Emily	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 4/10/2017, Bree Beitelschies

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.*
1

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
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school
525

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
5

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	61	64	65	91	73	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	431
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	29	30	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	20	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	15	32	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	4	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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	69	73	92	80	79	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	24	34	35	31	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	36	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	43	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	17	9	28	18	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	7	13	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	69	73	92	80	79	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	24	34	35	31	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	36	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	43	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	17	9	28	18	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	7	13	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	36%	53%	56%				33%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						52%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						56%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	50%	50%				45%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						65%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						48%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	59%	59%				32%	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	24%	52%	-28%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	33%	51%	-18%	53%	-20%
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	14	34	38	27	56	65	5				
ELL	24	54	77	50	43	42	6				
BLK	43	62		67	54						
HSP	34	52	59	54	53	50	21				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	36	51		53	60		40				
FRL	35	54	59	55	56	57	26				

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	16	22	18	25	33	25	8				
ELL	26	44		31	26		17				
BLK	43			50							
HSP	32	48	55	37	30	20	22				
WHT	30	48		41	39		29				
FRL	31	47	42	38	33	35	23				

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	16	46	59	37	56	43	15				
ELL	21	41	44	38	67	55	16				
BLK	20	27		13	18						
HSP	29	47	52	41	70	57	26				
WHT	45	63		62	68		47				
FRL	33	52	54	44	64	46	34				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	22
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

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	57
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	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	46
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?

Proficiency in reading rose from 32% to 36% but is still below our goal of 50%. Each year approximately 75% of students come into 3rd grade below level in reading. We have been unable to increase the number of students reading on-level in grades K-2. Students have also struggled with basic number sense therefore most of our very low level 1 students did not make gain in math.

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

Proficiency in reading rose from 32% to 36% but is still below our goal of 50% in all grade levels. Math proficiency was strong in grades 3-5 with 55% proficient, but most students in the lowest level of level one did not make a years growth.

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

Too many students are below level in the primary grades in reading and mathematics. This gap continues in the intermediate grades. Poor attendance is a primary factor in that 40% of students school less than 90% of the time. We will focus on core instruction and strategies for acceleration and closing the gap with intensive small group instruction to accomplish the growth needed.

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

Mathematics proficiency rose from 39% to 55%, a 16 point increase. Bottom quartile students showed increases in ELA, 45% - 54%, and in Mathematics, 33% - 58%.

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

We used goal setting with students to increase the amount of student ownership to learning. Before each formative assessment, student set personal goals and were then rewarded when they reached those goals. Teacher gave scores to students the same day to increase momentum and interest. Data Dives were conducted with each teacher after each formative assessment, so that action steps could be developed for improvement.

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

Continue Data Dives after each formative assessment so that future learning is impacted positively. Before each unit of instruction, coaches and teachers identify prerequisite skills that need to be reviewed before layering a new concept on top of these skills.

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.

Exemplars in instructional practices related to goal setting, giving timely feedback to students and accelerating instruction will be shared with teachers during large and small group professional development. Learning walks to see the practice in action will follow professional development to cement the practice.

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

Side-by-side coaching, small group professional development, and PLC with planning/data dives will continue to sustain improvement.

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 2022 FSA scores, 36% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on ELA FSA. 53% of students made learning gains and 59% of the bottom quartile made learning gains. Subgroups: ESSA subgroup English Language Learners scored a proficiency percentage of 24% and SWD scored a proficiency rate of 14%. Students have unfinished learning in all grade levels. Teachers must address these gaps through acceleration and differentiation during whole/small group instruction and independent practice with aggressive monitoring and timely feedback to students. K-2 reading needs to be strengthened before students reach third grade.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Student proficiency in reading will rise as a result of standards or benchmark based planning to include accelerating core instruction, differentiation and aggressive monitoring with timely feedback to student to monitor learning through goal setting. All subgroups will rise to at least 41% of students reaching proficiency levels on the May 2023 State Progress Monitoring Tool.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Learning will be measured by state/district/ assessment in Fall, Winter and Spring. Results of these assessments will be disaggregated in data chats with coaches, administration, teachers and district leaders at least three times per year. More frequent school formative assessments will be given in order to adjust instruction for student success, offer feedback toward student goals and student rewards for making an individual goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Institute a systematic plan for standards based planning for core and small group instruction that includes acceleration and aggressive monitoring. 2. Use data from formative assessments of student learning, along with focused, timely feedback to students in order to accelerate learning during whole/small group instruction and independent practice.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the	In 2022, 36% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on ELA FSA. 53% of students made learning gains and 59% of the bottom quartile made learning gains. Subgroups: ESSA subgroup English Language Learners scored a proficiency percentage of 24% and SWD scored a proficiency rate of 14%. Students have unfinished learning in all grade levels. Teachers must address these gaps through

rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	acceleration and differentiation during whole/small group instruction and independent practice with aggressive monitoring and timely feedback to students. K-2 reading needs to be strengthened before students reach third grade.

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.

1a. Reading coaches and teacher leaders will facilitate planning for grades k-5 for 50 minutes at least twice weekly. Planning sessions will focus on benchmarks to teach, small group instruction, assessment for learning, aggressive monitoring laps with data chats to discuss success as well as reteach to increase mastery of the benchmark.

1b. Coaches and instructional aides will pull small targeted groups for teaching unmastered prerequisite skills in grades K-5 at least three times a week. Teachers will pull small groups daily that are targeted toward acceleration.

1c. Coaches and teacher leaders will provide targeted professional development to strengthen instructional practices and delivery. One professional development session per quarter with small group sessions or quick 10 minute professional development as needed. Administrators will give feedback toward progress.

1d. After school enrichment/acceleration group opportunities will be utilized to increase student learning time.

1e. Subgroups ELL and SWD will be included in all targeted groups when deemed non-proficient.

Person Responsible	Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on 2022 FSA scores, 55% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on Mathematics FSA. 56% of students made learning gains and 58% of the bottom quartile made learning gains. Subgroups: ESSA subgroup English Language Learners scored a proficiency percentage of 50% and SWD scored a proficiency rate of 27%. Students have unfinished learning in all grade levels. Teachers must address these gaps through acceleration and differentiation during whole/small group instruction and independent practice with aggressive monitoring and timely feedback to students. K-2 mathematics, specifically number sense, needs to be strengthened before students reach third grade.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Student proficiency in mathematics will rise as a result of standards or benchmark based planning to include accelerating core instruction, differentiation and aggressive monitoring with timely feedback to student to monitor learning through goal setting. All subgroups will rise to at least 41% of students reaching proficiency levels on the May 2023 State Progress Monitoring Tool.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Learning will be measured by state/district/ assessment in Fall, Winter and Spring. Results of these assessments will be disaggregated in data chats with coaches, administration, teachers and district leaders at least three times per year. More frequent school formative assessments will be given in order to adjust instruction for student success, offer feedback toward student goals and student rewards for making a individual goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Institute a systematic plan for standards based planning for core and small group instruction that includes acceleration and aggressive monitoring. 2. Use data from formative assessments of student learning, along with focused, timely feedback to students in order to accelerate learning during whole/small group instruction and independent practice

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

In 2022 FSA scores, 55% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on Mathematics FSA. 56% of students made learning gains and 58% of the bottom quartile made learning gains. Subgroups: ESSA subgroup English Language Learners scored a proficiency percentage of 50% and SWD scored a proficiency rate of 27%. Students have unfinished learning in all grade levels. Teachers must address these gaps through acceleration and differentiation during whole/small group instruction and independent practice with aggressive monitoring and timely feedback to students. K-2 mathematics, specifically number sense, needs to be strengthened before students reach third grade.

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.

1a. Math resource teachers and teacher leaders will facilitate planning for grades k-5 for 50 minutes at least once weekly. Planning sessions will focus on benchmarks to teach, small group instruction, assessment for learning, aggressive monitoring laps with data chats to discuss success as well as reteach to increase mastery of the benchmark.

1b. Resource teachers and instructional aides will pull small targeted groups for teaching unmastered prerequisite skills in grades K-5 at least three times a week. Teachers will pull small groups daily that are targeted toward acceleration.

1c. Resource teachers and teacher leaders will provide targeted professional development to strengthen instructional practices and delivery. One professional development session per quarter with small group sessions or quick 10 minute professional development as needed. Administrators will give feedback toward progress.

1d. After school enrichment/acceleration group opportunities will be utilized to increase student learning time.

1e. Subgroups ELL and SWD will be included in all targeted groups when deemed non-proficient.

Person Responsible

Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@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 teacher assessments and Iready assessments in May of 2022, an average of 50% of students k-2 are reading below level at the end of the year. Specifically, 43% were below level in kindergarten, 58% in 1st grade, and 49% below level in 2nd grade. Student have unfinished learning in all of these grade levels particularly in the areas of phonics, vocabulary and sight words. Teacher must address these gaps through differentiation during whole/small group instruction and independent practice with aggressive monitoring and timely feedback to students.

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

Based on 2022 FSA scores, 36% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on ELA FSA. 53% of students made learning gains and 59% of the bottom quartile made learning gains. A high percentage of students were reading below level 3 at each grade level. 76% below level 3 in 3rd grade. 54% below level 3 in 4th grade and 61% below level three in 5th grade. Students have unfinished learning in all grade levels particularly in the areas of decoding and fluency. Teachers must address these gaps through acceleration and differentiation during whole/small group instruction and independent practice with aggressive monitoring and timely feedback to students.

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)

Greater than 50% of students in grade k-2 will show they are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment in May of 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Greater than 50% of students in grade 3-5 will show they are on track to pass or score equivalent to a level 3 or higher on the statewide ELA assessment in May of 2023.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Students progress will be monitored by the state progress monitoring three times a year and also by district informal assessments. After each assessment, teachers will disaggregate student results and plan for changes to instruction or small group intervention.

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

Guy, Cindy, cindy.guy@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-2: Iready, Pathways to literacy, SIPPS, Wonders
3-5: Iready, SIPPS, Wonders

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?

Materials in all levels are used for intensive small group instruction to address the area of need. Instruction is tailored to the individual student or small group.

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. Reading coaches and teacher leaders will facilitate planning for grades k-5 for 50 minutes at least twice weekly. Planning sessions will focus on benchmarks to teach, small group instruction, assessment for learning, aggressive monitoring laps with data chats to discuss success as well as reteach to increase mastery of the benchmark. 2.. Coaches and instructional aides will pull small targeted groups for teaching unmastered prerequisite skills in grades K-5 at least three times a week. Teachers will pull small groups daily that are targeted toward acceleration. 3. Coaches and teacher leaders will provide targeted professional development to strengthen instructional practices and delivery. One professional development session per quarter with small group sessions or quick 10 minute professional development as needed. Administrators will give feedback toward progress.	Guy, Cindy, cindy.guy@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.

Through our Community School Initiative, Gibsonton Elementary conducts surveys to all stakeholders to find out the needs and barriers to success for all students. The Community Resource teacher works with families and staff to meet the various needs that come up through out the year. We will also use the results from the Panorama Survey of students to identify areas of SEL needs that can be worked on to strengthen the social/emotional for all students. Specifically we will:
1. Strategically share information using a variety of modalities regarding upcoming events and opportunities for families.
2. Create and administer parent surveys regarding engagement and opportunities on quarterly basis.
3. Use improvement science methodology to problem solve the existing areas of attendance, behavior and parent involvement. New areas of need will also use this approach to solve the problem.

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

Administrators: Create the opportunity and encourage teacher leaders to create or lead the culture and parent involvement committees.
Teachers and other school based staff: Create, lead or support the culture and parent involvement committees. Help obtain resources necessary for student and family success.
District staff: Support efforts on the committees and provide resources that are available in the district or community.