

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Knights Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

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

Knights Elementary School

4815 N KEENE RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Janine Hall

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2008

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* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Knights Elementary School

4815 N KEENE RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[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	54%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Knights Elementary will be an informed, collaborative, community focused together on evidenced based practices which ensure that every student will grow into a successful leader of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Knights Elementary will work together as a team to ensure the success of every student.

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
Hall, Janine	Principal	Act in the role of instructional leader to facilitate discussion based on school improvement, improved teaching practice and student learning.
Way, Leanne	Assistant Principal	In partnership with the principal, act in the role of instructional leader to facilitate discussion based on school improvement, improved teaching practice and student learning.
Conrad, Kimberly	Reading Coach	In partnership with the principal and the assistant principal, the reading coach will act in the role of instructional leader to facilitate discussion based on school improvement, improved teaching practice and student learning.
Napier-Delgado, Victoria	SAC Member	Ms. Napier is a kindergarten teacher and our SAC chair. In this role she is an instructional leader at our school and collaborates with teachers and families

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/20/2008, Janine Hall

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.*

4

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

605

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

3

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	71	85	97	113	104	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	22	20	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	33	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	33	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	1	2	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	33	86	89	117	90	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	23	23	23	26	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	25	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	25	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	6	25	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	2	8	9	7	25	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	2	41	38	19	34	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
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	33	86	89	117	90	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	23	23	23	26	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	25	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	25	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	6	25	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	2	8	9	7	25	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	2	41	38	19	34	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	53%	56%				49%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						50%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						62%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	50%	50%				59%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						66%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						60%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	59%	59%				47%	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	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
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	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	53%	-7%
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	19	48	50	23	53	54	21				
ELL	33	67	67	47	71	71	24				
HSP	34	57	61	48	71	72	36				
MUL	58			58							
WHT	57	58	65	63	68	67	60				
FRL	41	59	63	54	72	70	43				
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	21	20	30	31	40	50	30				
ELL	29	33	17	41	58	50	19				
HSP	32	38	21	42	60	45	33				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	60	57	50	61	64	67	61				
FRL	41	44	35	48	61	52	40				
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	31	22	31	42	59	55	26				
ELL	30	50	64	45	63	65	18				
BLK	36			45							
HSP	41	53	70	56	71	70	38				
MUL	50			40							
WHT	56	50	67	64	67	71	55				
FRL	44	50	62	54	65	58	42				

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	58
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	63
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	58
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?

The percent of students in grades 3-5 who are proficient in reading was 46%, which is a 1% increase from the previous year. Science increased to 47 %, which is a 3% increase from last year. The subgroups of SWD still scored below the 41% goal in reading but did increase by several percentage points to 38%. In addition, ELL and Hispanic increased and scored over the 41% minimum score this past year.

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

While both areas increased slightly from the previous year, reading and science continue to be a focus area for overall growth. In addition, reading is a focus area for growth for students with disabilities.

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 need high levels of individualized, specific instruction, that is directed at their level while still receiving overall instruction in all of the standards.

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

All areas showed improvement from the previous year. Math overall showed the most improvement. Math increased 4% in basic proficiency to 55%. Gains in math increased 10 points to 70% and gains in math lowest quartile increase 20% to 70%.

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

Differentiated instruction in all grade levels for all students.

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

Students require additional levels of multi-tiered support to accelerate their learning to the level that is necessary to meet or exceed an adequate proficiency level.

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

We will provide individualized PD opportunities that are tailor made for groups of teachers based on a specific data review and goal setting.

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

Hiring extra tutors to provide individual, differentiated, instruction. Layer instruction so that our highest need populations (ESE & ELL) receive four tiers of individualized instruction while still be accelerated in core instruction. Progress monitor all students especially those who are ELL or SWD.

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 the 2022 ELA FSA scores 39% in third grade and 52% in 4th grade and 54% in fifth grade scored at proficiency (Level 3 or higher). Students still have academic deficits due to loss of school time in 2020 and 2021. Students need to receive additional layers of carefully planned instruction to compensate for lost learning. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include an increase in student talk, clarity of understanding and an increase in student ownership of work, differentiation and scaffolding to support diverse learners in all settings.

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

The percent of 3rd grade students scoring a 3 or higher will increase to 50% as measured by the FSA assessment. Students in 4th and 5th grade will also increase overall proficiency.

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

Teachers will use progress monitoring and student led goal setting to monitor and drive the instructional focuses listed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

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

Utilize formative data to help plan for appropriate levels of scaffolding that will engage students collaboratively, increase student talk and make their learning visible.

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

This strategy was chosen to enable students to increase their ownership and clarity in the instructional practice.

criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Facilitate a school wide professional development using the book The success Criteria Play book by Almarode, Fisher, Thunder and Frey (2021), which focuses on ways to make learning visible and measurable by establishing criteria for success. Meet with teachers regularly in ILT & PLC's to discuss data trends and follow up with mini PD coaching for grade levels or individual teachers as needed.

Person Responsible Kimberly Conrad (kimberly.conrad@hcps.net)

Conduct walk throughs to collect evidence of look fors and lesson implementation. Provide feedback to teachers based on observations.

Person Responsible Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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 the 2022 ELA FSA, In grades 3, 4 and 5 38% of the SWD scored proficient in ELA. An analysis of practice indicates that our SWD population continues to require additional support in the classroom to be successful. We will continue to layer instruction designed to meet the additional needs of students with disabilities by using careful planning and constant progress monitoring on an on-going basis. Then based on the progress monitoring, we will provide intensive instruction aligned to individual student needs throughout the four tiers of instruction this group receives.

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

The percent of 3, 4, and 5th grade students with disabilities scoring at a 3 or higher on the FSA assessment will increase to 41%.

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

Students will be actively involved in progress monitoring of their own learning goals and instructional practice will implement a higher degree of layering additional supports to provide increased scaffolding where needed for students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

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

Teachers will use formative data to help plan for appropriate levels of additional scaffolding that will engage students collaboratively to enhance learning visible. Additional attention will be placed on establishing and sharing success criteria with the students so they can monitor their own progress.

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

Students need additional layers of instruction to fill in the learning gaps they have amassed over the years.

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The schedule of each student with disabilities will be carefully analyzed and created to include all four tiers of support which align seamlessly with the expected standards and provides the additional instruction they need scaffolded to their level. These schedules will be monitored throughout the year and adjustments will be made as needed to ensure student success.

Person Responsible Janine Hall (janine.hall@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

Teachers will use formative data to help plan for appropriate levels of additional scaffolding that will engage students collaboratively and make their learning visible. In grades K-2 focus will be on phonics development and increasing comprehension through small group instruction and additional layers of support.

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

Teachers will use formative data to help plan for appropriate levels of additional scaffolding that will engage students collaboratively and make their learning visible. In grades 3-5 the focus will be on filling in gaps that currently exist in student's understanding how to read combined with increasing comprehension through small group instruction and additional layers of support.

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)

In grades K-2, Kdg and frist grade show end of the year proficiency at 52% and 65% respectively. The grade level for focus under RAISE in primary is second grade with a proficiency of 41%. The goal for the 22-23 school year will be to increase this level to 50%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In grades 3-5, 4th grade shows proficiency at 52%. The grade levels under focus for RAISE are 3rd and 5th which show end of the year proficiency below expectation at 38% and 48% respectively. The goal for the 22-23 school year will be to increase this level to 50%

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the principal and assistant principal by conducting walk throughs to collect evidence of look fors and lesson implementation. Feedback will be provided to teachers based on these observations and admin will follow up to assist with implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hall, Janine, janine.hall@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?

Evidenced based practices and programs that are supported by the district, meet the BEST standards and align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidenced based Reading Plan will be used in all grade levels.

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?

With guidance from the reading coach and administration teachers will use evidence-based practices and programs to address areas of identified need.

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
Progress monitoring with daily and monthly data reviews will be a part of each grade level's PLC practices and regular classroom practice. Based on the progress monitoring results the teachers will adjust instruction.	Hall, Janine, janine.hall@hcps.net
Teachers will participate in a PD based on The success Criteria PlayBook (2020). This strategy focuses on helping students to understand the success criteria of everything they are working on. This helps students and teachers create learning experiences that are visible and measurable. After identifying success criteria teachers will use the process of serial review to re-visit learning in areas that students struggle.	Hall, Janine, janine.hall@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.

Knights builds a positive culture through the use of a school wide social emotional learning program to develop and mentor character education. All stakeholders work together in this process, which is monitored and adjusted as needed for individual students and classrooms. Knights participates in many activities to further develop students including Say Hello Week, NEHS club, Daily SEL lessons, Say No to Drugs Week, etc.

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

- 1) Social services team consisting of Guidance, Social work and Psychology work with teachers to develop our school wide character education program. They also provide support in the classroom through visits, lessons and individual counseling.
- 2) Teachers take an active role in social emotional learning by providing daily opportunities for instruction through direct lessons, morning meetings and intervention.