Lewis Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lewis Elementary School

6700 WHITEWAY DR, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Babanats

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2022

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 (47%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (52%)
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

Lewis Elementary School

6700 WHITEWAY DR, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

[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	80%

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.

Learn Here, Succeed Anywhere!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roland H. Lewis Elementary School will provide every student with a safe Learning Environment Where Individuals are Successful.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Babanats, Melissa	Principal	Oversees school wide progress
Hinton, Carmon	Assistant Principal	oversees school progress
Schisler, Kimberly	SAC Member	Conducts SAC meetings
Kelly, Kingsley	Other	Conducts SAC meetings

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/18/2022, Melissa Babanats

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Total number of students enrolled at the school
600

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

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	78	76	95	113	90	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	34	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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 10/12/2022

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	89	104	108	110	99	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	28	36	35	43	18	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	15	39	40	32	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
Course failure in Math	0	0	30	52	30	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	1	0	0	7	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	89	104	108	110	99	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	28	36	35	43	18	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	15	39	40	32	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
Course failure in Math	0	0	30	52	30	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	1	0	0	7	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	40%	53%	56%				48%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						53%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						35%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	42%	50%	50%				48%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	57%						56%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						41%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	59%	59%				44%	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	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

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	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	53%	-11%
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	20	45	44	24	44	38	22				
ELL	38	48	40	41	62		21				
BLK	31	47	43	35	48	45	20				
HSP	46	55	36	42	59	64	38				
MUL	33			33							
WHT	58	68		59	73		46				
FRL	34	51	46	37	51	50	28				

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	19	28	29	22	20	6	31				
ELL	39	18		47	20		27				
BLK	38	41	38	27	22	12	20				
HSP	39	34	31	39	32		30				
MUL	29			37							
WHT	70	59		60	52		63				
FRL	39	37	29	34	26	11	31				

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	24	47	42	33	45	47	21				
ELL	39	41	31	55	69	45	10				
ASN	60	30		70	80						
BLK	39	49	32	35	45	33	29				
HSP	39	43	53	45	54	41	33				
MUL	57	50		48	43						
WHT	70	71	30	71	74		76				
FRL	39	47	35	39	49	41	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	43
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	38
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	51
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	33
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
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	44
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?

FSA data trends indicates subgroups ELA SWD achievement is at 20% and is lower than the other subgroups.

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

SWD gains in math and reading are an area of concern.

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

Due to a loss in SWD and an increase in SWD students. Teachers will strategically plan for accelerations.

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

Bottom math gains showed the largest gains in 2021. However SWD, our African American, and Multi-Racial population continues to be below 41% proficiency.

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

Differentiation and a focus on student ownership were continued factors to this improvement. We will streamline our mentoring program for SWD, African American, Multiracial to increase ownership and motivation.

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

Prior year data and baseline assessment will be used to identify areas of acceleration. Team planning and PLCs will address best practices for acceleration.

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 will receive training in acceleration verses remediation. Coaching cycles, PLC, and job embedded professional development will serve as a support as support as well.

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

Continuous feedback based on walk throughs will ensure sustainability. Professional development substitutes will provide further opportunities for peer observations. model classrooms, and embedded PD.

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 Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Area of focus-involve all stakeholders in an effort to increase student engagement by planning quality, core instruction. Rationale-to increase overall proficiency and overall learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	All subgroups will reach or maintain 41% or above proficiency.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Leadership team will attend planning sessions and PLC's. Frequent, specific and timely feedback will be provided through walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Increase the culture of learning through purposeful, professional development for strategic planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Purposeful professional development will lend itself to increase learning gains and proficiency in all sub groups.

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.

1. Conduct grade level standard best planning sessions.
2. Regularly scheduled PLC meetings
3. Purposeful differentiated instruction.
4. Culturally Responsive training and management courses.
5. Coaching cycles and feedback sessions.
6. Frequent walkthrough feedback with an emphasis on instructional priorities.
7. Inclusion model will increase the success of SWD and black subgroup will be closely monitored on data tracker.

Person Responsible	Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Area of Focus- There is a need to to improve proficiency and gains in math in the bottom quartile according to the FSA.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Math proficiency, math gains, and math bottom quartile will increase by 5 points on the FAST assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The area of focus will be monitored by PLC, data chats, planning sessions and walkthrough with frequent feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Increase the culture of learning through purposeful professional development and strategic planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Purposeful professional development and feedback will lend itself to increase learning gains and proficiency.

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.

1. Conduct grade level standard based planning sessions.
2. Regularly scheduled PLC's meetings.
3. Purposeful differentiated instruction.
4. Culturally responsive training and management courses.
5. Coaching cycles and feedback sessions
6. Frequent walkthrough feedback with an emphasis on instructional priorities.

Person Responsible	Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the final iReady Diagnostic in Spring 2022, _____% of K-2 students scored "Mid-Year, Late-Year and Above" in Reading, Teachers spent a great deal of time learning the new standards and curriculum resources, which observation data show had a positive impact on whole group, or shared, instruction. Deeper planning for small group rotations and individual student needs is needed. Teachers will plan each weekly unit as a team, then reflect and plan on a weekly basis toward mastery of daily objectives and targeted small group rotations with consideration of our teacher and student priority look-fors. Administration and content coaches will participate in weekly planning.

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

According to 2022 FSA in Reading, 40% of 3rd-5th graders scored a level 3 or higher. With new standards and curriculum resources in 3-5, we will increase teacher clarity around new BEST standards for ELA in 3-5 through weekly collaborative planning sessions. These sessions will begin with planning for the 6 week unit, and then working through each week by reviewing student data and needs to inform instruction. Administration and content coaching will participate in weekly planning.

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)

Based on iReady Final Diagnostic AND FAST Data, 50% of K-2 students will score ON LEVEL.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on iReady Final Diagnostic AND FAST Data, 50% of 3-5 students will score ON 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.

Through the Leadership Team (administration and content coaches) and Instructional Leadership Team (teacher leaders), walkthrough trends and student data will be systematically analyzed on a weekly basis, with adjustments to instruction and groupings made as needed. Data analysis is scheduled out based on the following assessment calendar: iReady Diagnostic 1, checkpoints, unit assessments, FAST assessments.

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

Babanats, Melissa, melissa.babanats@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?

Collaborative standards aligned planning with a focus on teacher and student clarity is recognized in John Hattie's work, Visible Learning, as a research based best practice.

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?

Feedback and student data from similar schools in the district demonstrate this practice is effective. Additionally, prior data in student learning gains indicate success.

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy coaching through collaborative planning and walkthrough feedback cycles will be implemented on a weekly basis.	Babanats, Melissa, melissa.babanats@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.

School improvement will be enhanced by hosting parent information nights with an academic focus. We will invite parent comments and questions on all invitations. Communication will be enhanced by sharing invitations and information through different platforms.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, and Guidance Counselor along with behavior committee of teachers will take the lead in overseeing systems and positive incentives.