Kenly Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kenly Elementary School

2909 N 66TH ST, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jeffrey Cooley   Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Kenly Elementary School

[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	93%

School Grades History

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

The community of scholars evolving into tomorrow's leaders!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kenly ensures an equitable education that empowers students to be successful.

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
Cooley, Jeffrey	Principal	Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/2/2022, Jeffrey Cooley

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
26

Total number of students enrolled at the school
417

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
10

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	63	62	60	68	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Friday 8/26/2022

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	79	67	62	83	62	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	433
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	9	8	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	0	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	79	67	62	83	62	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	433
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	9	8	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	0	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	27%	53%	56%				25%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						43%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						40%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	50%	50%				24%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						36%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	88%						38%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	59%	59%				36%	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	19%	55%	-36%	58%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

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	17%	54%	-37%	62%	-45%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	22%	57%	-35%	64%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	53%	-19%
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	10	56	52	25	68	86	9				
ELL	14	57		52	86		20				
BLK	28	49	46	52	73	89	30				
HSP	20	60		52	77		26				
MUL				50							
WHT	44	64		47	55						
FRL	25	52	47	51	72	88	33				

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	4	50	69	22	77	92	8				
ELL	17			50							
BLK	22	50	67	32	83	92	22				
HSP	21	60		40	79		33				
WHT	53			61							
FRL	24	55	72	38	81	94	30				

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	8	28	32	9	30	31	22				
ELL	15	43		22	48						
BLK	21	43	29	19	29	38	28				
HSP	23	45	50	31	46		31				
MUL	20			10							
WHT	43	38		36	48		64				
FRL	25	42	38	24	35	37	36				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50

English Language Learners	
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	52
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	50
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	50
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	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Overall ELA proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year was 26.8 percent. ELL proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year was 14.3 percent.

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

In 2022 ELA proficiency was the lowest performing reporting category.

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

Students not meeting on grade level expectations. Planning for on grade level benchmarks and scaffolding to meet students needs. Increase teacher depth of knowledge around ELA benchmarks and prerequisite skills to better meet student individual needs.

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

In 2022 math proficiency increased from 38 percent in 2021 to 51 percent in 2022.

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

Individual student goal setting. Tracking student data towards proficiency. Common planning with data analysis to make modifications to long term and short term instructional goals.

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

Incorporate professional development within planning sessions.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities aligned with BEST standards.

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

In addition to reading coach and math coach support, MTSS RTI resource teacher will support teachers with a using appropriate interventions that meet the needs of individual students.

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.**	Student achievement can be derived when all students are exposed to and engaged in on grade level standards-based lessons that are purposeful, differentiated, and pose a clear path to content mastery. Tasks, lessons, and assessments that are planned through the collaboration of grade level and subject area coaches will ensure that content is aligned to the BEST standards and student needs.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	80 percent of teachers lessons provide opportunities for the students to engage in tasks that are aligned to grade level benchmarks.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Evidence of desired outcome will be collected through a walkthrough form created by the ILT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeffrey Cooley (jeffrey.cooley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Administration and ILT will analyze walkthrough data to determine opportunities for growth and professional development based on walkthrough data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	To find find high leverage trends that impact student success. Based on trends, additional professional development and school wide support will be created.

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.

Reading Coach will plan with teachers weekly during common planning time to support clarity around Benchmarks.

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Cooley (jeffrey.cooley@hcps.net)

Reading coach and administration will analyze data bi-weekly to determine instructional next steps.

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Cooley (jeffrey.cooley@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

Grades K-2 will focus on Foundational Skills using SIPPS and Wonders Foundational Skills to increase reading fluency and decoding based on components of the K-2 screener and IReady Diagnostic.

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

Grades 3-5 will focus on building fluency and decoding with specific students and focus on the presentation and delivery of effective reading practices based on FSA data and IReady diagnostics.

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)

80% of our K-2 students will increase their foundational skills levels to proficiency using the components of the K-2 screener and increase their IReady percentile by 10% as measured by the Spring Diagnostic.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

80% of our 3-5 students will increase their percentage as measured by the Spring IReady Diagnostic during the 2022-2023 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.

K-2 – K-2 will be monitored using the Beginning, Middle and End K-2 Foundational Skills Screener Components. We will use the I-Ready Diagnostics Fall, Winter and Spring to determine small groups and interventions needed. Instructional lessons from Wonders, SIPPS, IReady toolbox and BrainSpring for ESE students will be utilized.3-5 – Grades 3-5 will be monitored using the Fall, Winter and Spring I-Ready Diagnostic and the PM1, PM2 and PM3 from the F.A.S.T. assessment. This will determine small group instruction and interventions needed. Instructional lessons will come from Magnetic Reading in I-Ready, I-Ready toolbox, Wonders, SIPPS and BrainSpring for ESE Students.

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

Sims, Kesha, kesha.sims@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 - SIPPS is a foundational skills program that is evidence based to teach phonemic awareness, phonics, and decoding skills to learners. Wonders foundational skill lessons also support teaching phonics and decoding skills. These programs align to our reading plan and align to the BEST ELA standards. Additional support from BrainSpring for ESE lessons. 3-5 - Magnetic Reading in I-Ready supports the science of reading to students and is BEST standards aligned. I-Ready (lessons aligned to BEST), I-Ready toolbox, Wonders, SIPPS, Achieve 3000, and BrainSpring for ESE Students, will also be utilized in the planning of instruction for students.

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?

Many of these programs are purchased by the county and have shown that when students utilize the programs with validity, the students show growth over time. SIPPS provides foundational and decoding skills for reading, while I-Ready and Wonders also has those components, these programs along with Achieve 3000 support the comprehension in high interest, high quality lessons to increase reading fluency and comprehension to build up students reading levels.

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

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy coaching using the coaching side by side or coteach model will be used to address the instructional practices and delivery of instructional routines to meet the needs of learners. Planning sessions will be held to ensure that that lesson learning targets and objectives are planned for and student outcomes are targeted and met.	Sims, Kesha, kesha.sims@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.

Kenly Elementary is implementing positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) is an evidence based three- tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. Students can earn up to 10 points per day. PBIS expectations are being respectful, being responsible, owning your actions, trying your best.

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

PBIS committee includes one teacher from each grade level. Kindergarten- Ms. Lewis. First grade- Ms. Nicolas. Second grade- Ms. Badertscher. Third grade Ms. A. Miller. Fourth grade- Franklin. Fifth grade- Ms. Schoenrock. Early Childhood- Ms. L. Brown and Ms. Daly.