
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 |

Kimbell Elementary School

8406 N 46TH ST, Tampa, FL 33617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Erin Fiallo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: F (31%) 2017-18: F (28%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TSI |
| * 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 |

Kimbell Elementary School

8406 N 46TH ST, Tampa, FL 33617

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>89%</p> |

School Grades History

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

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 have students who:
 Love learning
 Excel in all they do
 Achieve goals together
 Do what is right

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 92% by 2024. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Kimbell's vision:
 Creating lifelong leaders who take charge of their learning and impact society in a positive way.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Harris, Carmen | Principal | Facilitate and support school vision; instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others |
| Fiallo, Erin | Assistant Principal | |
| Creed, Temetia | Instructional Coach | Provides leadership with data analysis and curriculum |
| Armstrong, Jackie | Math Coach | Provides leadership with data analysis and curriculum |
| Bass, Stephanie | Science Coach | Provides leadership with data analysis and curriculum |
| Taylor, Victoria | Reading Coach | Provides leadership with data analysis and curriculum |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/25/2022, Erin Fiallo

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

0

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

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Total number of students enrolled at the school

375

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

14

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

3

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 | 57 | 54 | 49 | 55 | 51 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 321 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 26 | 23 | 22 | 16 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| 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 | 29 | 31 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 32 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 30 | 27 | 36 | 28 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |

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 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/28/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 66 | 46 | 56 | 59 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 35 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 13 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 23 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 0 | 66 | 46 | 56 | 59 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 35 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 13 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 23 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 29% | 53% | 56% | | | | 25% | 52% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | | | | | | 42% | 55% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | | | | | | 47% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 31% | 50% | 50% | | | | 18% | 54% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | | | | | | 26% | 57% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | | | | | | 28% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 35% | 59% | 59% | | | | 30% | 50% | 53% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 19% | 52% | -33% | 58% | -39% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 24% | 55% | -31% | 58% | -34% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -19% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 54% | -24% | 56% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -24% | | | | |

| 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 | 14% | 54% | -40% | 62% | -48% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 19% | 57% | -38% | 64% | -45% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -14% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 12% | 54% | -42% | 60% | -48% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -19% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 26% | 51% | -25% | 53% | -27% |
| 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 | 16 | 35 | 38 | 24 | 35 | 27 | 7 | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 39 | | 31 | 48 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 52 | 53 | 24 | 40 | 35 | 26 | | | | |
| HSP | 27 | 52 | | 34 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | | | 47 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 52 | 48 | 29 | 48 | 42 | 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 | 18 | 29 | | 23 | 33 | | 47 | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 55 | | 32 | 55 | | 50 | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 50 | | 22 | 35 | 50 | 41 | | | | |
| HSP | 18 | 38 | | 28 | 62 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | | | 27 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 23 | 46 | 71 | 26 | 45 | 50 | 49 | | | | |
| 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 | 9 | 31 | 47 | | 14 | 25 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 38 | 45 | 20 | 28 | | 13 | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 38 | 48 | 17 | 25 | 30 | 26 | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 40 | 42 | 18 | 30 | | 28 | | | | |
| WHT | 35 | 83 | | 24 | 23 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 25 | 42 | 49 | 17 | 25 | 30 | 30 | | | | |

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) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 286 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 26 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 34 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 36 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 44 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 44 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?

The trends that emerge for 3rd-5th are lower levels of proficiency in third grade (20%) and math achievement was (25%). 4th and 5th demonstrated a little over a 3rd of students proficient for ELA. 4th math shows the closest to 50% at 40%. 5th students were at 26% achievement in math. 5th science was predicted to be over 50% based on internal assessments, however we only achieved 35% proficient.

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

Current 4th graders are demonstrating the greatest need for improvement based on 2022 scores. Students in rising 4th, scored the lowest in both math and reading content.

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

Some of the factors were long term vacancies and inconsistent instructional needs. New actions that are needed to take place include increased small group individualized instruction greater progress monitoring to make appropriate adjustments in a timely manner.

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

The most improvement was 4th grade ELA from 9% to 33% in 2022, plus 24 percent. 4th math 7% to 40%, plus 33% change.

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

One of the contributing factors was differentiated small group instruction, student ownership of goal setting and data tracking and a focus on proficiency with grade level content.

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

An early starting intervention plan (PUSH plan); ensure teachers understand and implement BEST standards. Looking at the 4 principles of instruction, with an emphasis on Teacher Clarity to ensure students are clear on purpose, task and "ask", and students are able to demonstrate learning in written and oral form.

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.

Teachers and staff will engage in professional development around Teacher Clarity, with an emphasis on modeling and thinking aloud, robust questions and direct instruction.

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

Adding additional site based coaches, MGT support, systems and structures for planning, PLC, coaching cycles, academic services meetings; workflow meetings (pillars of school 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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

We have 90% new classroom teachers to the building and are in need of professional development that will assist teachers in growing their practice around teacher clarity, specifically related to supporting students owning their own thinking.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Instruction employs practices that allow all students to learn the content of the lesson and demonstrate responsibility for doing the thinking in the classroom.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership developed look-fors specific to identified descriptors (trend data), walk throughs and feedback of planning to practice, lesson planning through classroom observations and Academic Services Meeting and Data Analysis Meetings. We will know we are successful when teachers: A) Share the what, why and how of learning B) Make learning visible through verbal expression and thinking aloud.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Harris (carmen.harris@hcps.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Teacher Modeling and Thinking aloud, asking robust questions and direct explanations. Students will track data too and show their thinking in written and oral forms.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

All strategies have a effect size of .6 or higher, which is proven to show effectiveness in student instruction and growth. We will engage in Doug Fisher's research based approach to yield positive results.

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.

Professional Development will provided to teachers to support implementation of teacher clarity within their instructional practice, ongoing throughout the year, through our Lesson Rehearsals. Lesson Rehearsals are demonstration lessons that take place before teaching content and are designed to model exemplar work. This helps teachers to be prepared to deliver high-quality lessons. Teacher will be monitored and coached to support their implementation.

Person Responsible

Temetia Creed (temetia.creed@hcps.net)

Facilitated lesson planning will occur twice weekly with coaches and teachers. These will provide teachers with curriculum support and implementation ideas. Teachers walk away with lessons for the upcoming week.

Person Responsible Victoria Taylor (victoria.taylor@hcps.net)

Classroom Walkthroughs and feedback are provided daily to teachers around their classroom practice, from school administration and coaches.. Teachers are allowed the opportunity to receive immediate feedback to impact their instructional practice.

Person Responsible Carmen Harris (carmen.harris@hcps.net)

Coaching Cycles are provided based on teacher need (frequency based on tier) and trend data collected to show areas of focus. Coaches are assigned from admin or based on their observations (teacher request) coaching cycle focus to support student learning and teacher growth.

Person Responsible Jackie Armstrong (jackie.armstrong1@hcps.net)

Instructional Leadership Team will meet monthly to build teacher leadership capacity and grow the instructional community within the school. This team meets monthly and help to promote healthy dialogue around school instructional priorities and endorse coaching cycles. Administration, coaches and teachers make up this team.

Person Responsible Magdalene Ford (magadelene.ford@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

Utilizing EOY I-Ready, we will triangulate data with Quarter 1 FAST assessment to determine targeted students for quarter 2, 3 and 4, push plans and strategies.

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

Utilizing EOY I-Ready and FSA, we will triangulate data with Quarter 1 FAST assessment to determine targeted students for quarter 2, 3 and 4, push plans and strategies.

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)

Grades K-2 were 25% proficient in reading and the goal is 50% for the 22-23 school year. To support this work, the team will use I-Ready indicators to determine the progress towards this goal.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Grades 3rd- 20%; 4th-33%; 5th-32% proficient in reading and the goal is 50% for the 22-23 school year. To support this work, the team will use I-Ready indicators to determine the progress towards this goal.

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.

Leadership developed look-fors specific to identified descriptors (trend data), walk throughs and feedback of planning to practice, lesson planning through classroom observations and Academic Services Meeting and Data Analysis Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Harris, Carmen, carmen.harris@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?

We will use Teacher Clarity as our identified evidence-based practice to improve instruction, based on an effect size of .6. This strategy aligns with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and B.E.S.T. standards.

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?

This is a high yield strategy, based on effect size to impact teacher practice and student achievement. The work by Douglas Fisher shows supports and helps with professional development actions.

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 |
|---|--|
| Coaching Cycles provide support to teacher growth with Teacher Clarity will be provided through lesson rehearsals. This will occur weekly and includes teachers and coaches. | Creed, Temetia, temetia.creed@hcps.net |
| Professional Development will provided to support building teacher capacity around teacher clarity and delivering strong instructional experiences. Teacher will meet monthly to craft their work around teacher clarity with coaches. | Taylor, Victoria, victoria.taylor@hcps.net |
| Lesson Planning and Feedback of Plans to Practice will be provided weekly by coaches and administration to support teacher practice around implementation and determine next steps. Feedback is collected individually and as trend data. | Fiallo, Erin, erin.fiallo@hcps.net |
| Walkthroughs for support will occur daily and allow teachers to see admin as support and allow space to build a coaching culture involving teachers, administration and coaches. | Harris, Carmen, carmen.harris@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.

For the 22-23 school year, we will reinstitute PTA and SAC for parents and community to invest in partnership with the school. We will introduce ALL pro Dads and Mom Making Moments for parents/guardians to be a part of the school community. We will have volunteer days for parents/guardians to participate in the life of the school.

We will host student government to allow choice and input in school practices. We will have quarterly incentive events to reward positive choices. We will host Wacky Wednesday once a month to celebrate student choices. We will have Cougar Cash and allow students to shop at the Cougar Cart.

We will have weekly shout-outs, opportunities for snacks (snack cart) and weekly connection moments for staff to build community. We will recognize each other and have a moment of connection each week.

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

Dr. Carmen Harris- vision/ role assigner
Erin Fiallo- lead implementer
Temetia Creed- implementer
Victoria Taylor- Implementer
Jackie Armstrong- Implementer
Stephanie Bass- Implementer
Lenor Holsey- Implementer
Gary Givens- Implementer