Lanier Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lanier Elementary School

4704 W MONTGOMERY AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Moon

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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

Lanier Elementary School

4704 W MONTGOMERY AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[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	66%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Lanier Elementary community will foster leadership skills while facilitating an education to develop each child to their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lanier's students will become lifetime learners and leaders who are prepared for life.

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
Moon, Kevin	Principal	
Gattullo, Kristen	Assistant Principal	
Scudder, Meagan	School Counselor	
Millis, Maria	Staffing Specialist	
Scanlon, June	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/13/2022, Kevin Moon

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

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

Total number of students enrolled at the school
372

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

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

9

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	55	63	54	51	51	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	12	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	11	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	8	14	20	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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	52	57	51	57	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	2	7	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	9	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	1	3	1	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	52	57	51	57	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	2	7	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	9	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	1	3	1	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	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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%				53%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						62%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						59%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	50%	50%				48%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	51%						55%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						43%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	59%	59%				43%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	38%	54%	-16%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	47%	51%	-4%	53%	-6%
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	28	28	38	47	65	6				
ELL	63	62		68	38						
BLK	16	35	18	43	61	73	15				
HSP	42	52		58	43		31				
MUL	47	43		68	36						
WHT	67	64		78	54		71				
FRL	39	47	29	61	51	60	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	26	48	60	41	70	90	17				
ELL	56			63							
BLK	30	36		43	50		23				
HSP	31	62		62	69		25				
MUL	54			62							
WHT	74	48		78	65		55				
FRL	48	52	57	59	63	92	41				
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	20	38	47	15	42	50	17				
ELL	9			27							
BLK	35	44		29	39		20				
HSP	38	60		40	56		37				
MUL	67			50							
WHT	66	61		59	61		75				
FRL	48	59	60	44	52	42	32				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	58
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	37
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	47
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	49
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	67
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	48
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 trends that have emerged across content areas are that we dropped across the board in all areas except for Math Proficiency. Some of our most significant drops occurred in our bottom quartile groups in both ELA and Math. When we look at specific grade levels, we can identify areas where there was some growth from one year to the next. Those areas include 3rd grade math which is sitting at 77% proficient which provided overall increase from 2021 to 2022 from 63% to 64% proficient across the grade levels.

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

Science Achievement in grades 5 stayed low at 40% of students scoring a L3+. Also, reading proficiency maintained similar to 2021 with overall proficiency of 46% and learning gains of 49% while out BQ in ELA dropped from 57% to 30%.

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

We believe that there is a misalignment between ELA and science assessments to classroom instruction. This year we will implement data-driven instructional techniques that proved to be successful in math and use them in ELA and science. For example, monthly progress monitoring with common assessments that are aligned to the rigor of the standards and allow us to analyze for misconceptions and re-teach concepts that were not mastered. In addition, classrooms will have a designated small group instruction area where students are engaged daily with individualized instruction based upon need.

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

Math Achievement in grades 3-5 increased in 2022. Through use of data driven instructional techniques, our 3rd grade math achievement increased from 75% proficiency to 78%. In 4th grade, 55% of students met proficiency and in 5th grade 57% of students met proficiency.

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

The use of data-driven instructional techniques to analyze common assessments, create action plans for re-teaching of concepts that were not mastered, and the use of aggressive monitoring of students to constantly monitor student learning and provide targeted instruction based on data.

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

Use of scaffolding to provide on grade level text as much as possible, previewing concepts in small group instruction prior to teaching them, and consistent spiral review of concepts in order to retain learning. We are implementing several strategies from the Driven by Data in order to provide targeted whole group and small group instruction based on assessment analysis results. In primary grades we are implementing a new Phonological and Phonemic Awareness program called Heggerty to address any deficiencies early on. In grades 3-5 we are purchasing a vocabulary program to assist teachers build further understanding through the use of Wordly Wise. In addition to these programs, targeted and individualized small groups instruction will be utilized to address acceleration and remediation across content areas. The school will also utilized common planning times to allow grade levels the opportunity to plan for that individualized instruction.

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

We will provide the following opportunities for Professional Development this year:
Learning walks to observe colleagues using Data-driven instruction strategies
Substitute coverage to allow teachers to observe effective instruction from peers at other sites
Lesson Study cycles for each grade level and common planning
Individual 1:1 teacher/admin coaching cycles to review student data and create action plans for student learning
Coaching and planning cycles with MTSS/RTI Resource Teacher

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

Social-Emotional Learning through Leader in Me curriculum
Goal setting and data tracking for all students and across content areas
MTSSS/RTI support from our resource teacher in planning and small group instruction
Frequent classroom observations with feedback cycles (4 per quarter for each teacher)
Implementation of our additional curriculum pieces in Wordly Wise and Heggerty Phonemic Awareness.

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 Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Collaborative planning allows us to analyze student data from common interim assessments and plan for differentiated, targeted instruction that meets the needs of all students. Collaborative planning will take place weekly by grade level and will be facilitated by the Leadership Team
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	ELA proficiency will improve from 46% to 60%, math will increase from 64% to 75% and Science proficiency will increase from 40% to 60% as measured by the FAST assessments in May 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monthly progress monitoring through common math, science and ELA assessments will allow us to monitor all student progress and implement necessary interventions as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Moon (kevin.moon@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Data-driven instructional strategies that allow us to plan for and provide targeted instruction that meets the needs of all students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research shows that data-driven instruction allows teachers to target specific needs of students and utilize strategies such as aggressive monitoring, small group instruction, spiral and reteach in order to ensure that students master content standards. We are using the work from the book, Driven by Data.

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.

Plan and organize monthly ELA, math and science assessments, to include:
1. Create calendar for monthly ELA/math/Science assessments for each grade level
2. Schedule PLC meetings each month to analyze assessment results and create action plans to address student learning needs.
3. Organize, copy, and distribute assessments for each grade every month.

Person Responsible	Kevin Moon (kevin.moon@hcps.net)

Create Systems to facilitate data analysis related to math monthly assessments, to include:
1. Create student goal setting and progress monitoring forms for students to complete
2. Create online data spreadsheets to monitor student progress each month in OneNote
3. Create agenda and data analysis forms to facilitate PLCs and dig deep into the data (item analysis, trends, misconceptions, action plan, etc.) Specifically address our ESSA Subgroup progress of SWD and Black students to monitor their progress.

Person Responsible	Kevin Moon (kevin.moon@hcps.net)

1. Utilize ELP funding to target specific ESSA groups such as our Black and SWD students who did not score proficient on the state ELA and/or Math assessment. ELP would include both after school and in

class support as well. This would ensure that students are seen daily in small group instruction that targets their specific needs.

2. Student progress would be tracked through performance task pieces and documented in our electronic data walls.

Person Responsible   Kristen Gattullo (kristen.gattullo@hcps.net)

#2. 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.**	Literacy is the heart of education and can be integrated into all subject areas. If literacy scores improve, all students will be better prepared for college and career. At Lanier, our ELA score increases have been minimal over the last 5 years. We seek to improve ELA planning and instruction in order to provide all students with high quality instruction in reading and writing that aligns with the new BEST state standards and best practices of literacy instruction.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	ELA proficiency will improve from 46% to 60% as measured by the New FAST assessments in May 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Weekly administrative observation and feedback cycles, monthly ELA assessment data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Moon (kevin.moon@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Targeted, Individualized small group instruction that provides acceleration to students in order to address their academic needs while also maintaining high expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for**	We know that many students at our school have significant learning gaps that need to be addressed. Small group re-teaching and using below grade level text will not provide the rigorous instruction needed to close the gaps. Therefore, we will implement acceleration strategies to scaffold and support students with accessing grade level text in order to meet their needs while keeping high academic expectations for all. We will also utilize 2 new programs to assist fill in the gaps called Wordly Wise in grades 2-5 and Heggerty in grades K-1.

selecting this strategy.

Create common assessments for ELA monthly. Each team will implement the following steps for each monthly common assessment:
-Meet 1 week prior to the assessment to preview the test and predict performance
-Provide adequate time and environment for testing, as well as accommodations for those who need them
-Meet within 72 hours of each assessment to share data analysis findings (item analysis, action plans, next
steps).
-Hold data chats and allow time for students to reflect on their performance

Person Responsible   Kevin Moon (kevin.moon@hcps.net)

Provide PD through learning walk cycles 3 times per year to observe other ELA teachers onsite and off site and provide peer coaching and feedback.

Person Responsible   Kevin Moon (kevin.moon@hcps.net)

Utilize our MTSS/RTI resource teacher to pull small groups of students for targeted individualized instruction based on the data collected from the common assessments.

Person Responsible   June Scanlon (june.scanlon@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

An instructional practice we plan to implement is targeted small group individualized instruction. We will also focus on vocabulary development during this time utilizing the Wordly Wise program in 2nd grade. In grades K and 1, we will focus on Phonemic Awareness through the Heggarty program.

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

In grades 3-5, we had proficiency less than 50%. The proficiency is as follows 3rd grade 48%, 4th grade 48% and 5th grade 40%. An instructional practice we plan to implement is targeted small group individualized instruction. We will also focus on vocabulary development during this time utilizing the Wordly Wise program.

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 order to evaluate the effectiveness of this, we will measure our PMA Data from Fall, Winter and Spring to ensure that students in grades K, 1 and 2 are meeting our proficiency goal of 60% in ELA. In addition, we will progress monitor through common assessments implemented at each grade level.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of this, we will measure our FAST Data from Fall, Winter and Spring to ensure that students in grades 3, 4 and 5 are meeting our proficiency goal of 60% in ELA. In addition, we will progress monitor through common assessments implemented at each grade level.

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.

Teachers and leadership team will meet after common grade level assessment are given in PLCs to review the data and monitor student progress. Teachers will use data to create small groups and resource team members will be deployed to work with and assist with small group instruction for students who continue to struggle. All data will be tracked through electronic data walls that are accessible to all staff through OneNote notebooks.

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

Moon, Kevin, kevin.moon@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?

Research has proven that a rich, varied vocabulary provides a critical foundation for reading comprehension and academic achievement. The National Reading Panel found that phonemic awareness instruction helped children of all levels improve their reading.

Wordly Wise provides:
-Research-based activities that align with current state and national standards and assessments.
-Differentiated reading and instructional support for teachers helping students performing below grade level.
-Peer sharing and interactive projects to encourage motivation and engagement.
-Access to Quizlet, the fun learning app that allows students to practice and master vocabulary.

Heggerty provides:
Studies have shown that phonemic awareness is a foundational skill, essential for learning to read. As students learn to identify sounds through oral and auditory activities, they become phonemically aware. Engaging in phonemic awareness instruction develops students' understanding of sounds, and that knowledge directly impacts their spelling and writing.

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?

These two programs will target the needs of our students to assist achievement in all grade levels. Our team of teachers identified these programs as resources that will be beneficial for our students and target deficiencies needed in order to grow.

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
Using these resources will allow our teachers the ability to have data that will be discussed at PLC's and planning sessions. Teachers will be able to work together to provide professional development for one another. Peer to Peer coaching sessions and observations will allow teachers to see how best to implement the programs with fidelity and success. We will utilize our MTSS/RTI resource teacher to provide support and pull additional targeted groups.	Moon, Kevin, kevin.moon@hcps.net
We will utilize our MTSS/RTI resource teacher to provide support and pull additional targeted groups. She will work with teachers in PLC's and PSLT meetings to identify data from the resources that supports students identified for additional small group instruction.	Scanlon, June, june.scanlon@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.

At Lanier, we place a strong emphasis on a positive school culture. We received an overall composite score of 94% on the 2021 ASQi culture survey, one of the highest rated in the district. In addition our ranking on the 2021-2022 Insight Staff Culture survey has us well above the district average across all 9 Domain scores. The student Panorama culture survey also indicates that our students feel connected to the school as all 4 domain scores also exceed the district average.

The 2022-23 school year will begin our 8th year of implementation with Franklin Covey's Leader in Me program, a school-wide transformational process that focus on leadership, culture, and academics. Lanier was recently named a Leaders in Me Lighthouse School, one of 400 exemplar models for the school worldwide. This process
allows us to address daily social-emotional lessons that are rooted in the 7 Habits of Highly Effective

People, hold daily morning meetings in each classroom to build and strengthen classroom culture, and allow all stakeholders to have a voice in school-wide decision making. Each student participates in the 4 Disciplines of Execution goal setting process, where they set individual academic goals and monitor their own progress towards these goals. We also provide our staff annual training to empower student leadership and foster student-centered learning in each classroom.

According to our Measurable Results Survey results (performed by Franklin Covey), two areas we have identified to improve for the 2022-23 school year are Trusting Relationships (rated 71/100) and School and Family Partnerships (rated 76/100). We will provide staff development on both of these topics to allow teachers to
have specific strategies and action plans to address both of these areas, as well as monitor our progress through quarterly student surveys.

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

School Leadership/Lighthouse Team- The School Lighthouse Teams consists of 17 staff members and drives the work of the Leader in Me program. Each of Lighthouse members have shared leadership roles to facilitate monthly Action Team meetings. Every staff member is a member of a action team, and these teams focus on promotion of positive school culture and learning environment. These action teams meet monthly to set goals, monitor progress, seek feedback, and take action to improve the the school.

Action Teams include:
Student Lighthouse
Shared Leadership
Create Leadership Environment
Adult Learning and Modeling
Teach students to Lead
Achieve Goals
Empower Learners

Community Partnerships- Grace Family Church is a close community partner for us. This year they will host 2 Beautification Days on campus, provide mentors to at-risk students, donate school supplies, and provide tutors for our KG students. In addition, they provide faculty boosters that boost morale via supply our synergy suite with snacks and resources for positive school culture.