

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lithia Springs 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

Lithia Springs Elementary School

4332 LYNX PAW TRL, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Amber Cronin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (71%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Lithia Springs Elementary School

4332 LYNX PAW TRL, Valrico, FL 33596

[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	No	23%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

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

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.

Lithia Springs will transform teaching and learning for our students by creating a student-centered ecosystem that empowers students to excel as 21st Century scholars and caring, active and positive members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Leading
Successful
Empowered
Students

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
Cronin, Amber	Principal	The Principal serves as an Instructional Leader, engages stakeholders and collaborates with others.
Carter, Shannon	SAC Member	The SAC Chair engages stakeholders within the school community, to include site based personnel, parents and community members.
Duggins, Christina	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves as an Instructional Leader, engages stakeholders and collaborates with others.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/13/2022, Amber Cronin

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

2

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

630

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

8

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

8

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	96	77	121	87	114	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	13	10	9	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	10	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	7	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 8/23/2022

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	92	73	123	89	105	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	92	73	123	89	105	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	78%	53%	56%				76%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						71%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						61%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	81%	50%	50%				75%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%						67%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						41%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	85%	59%	59%				77%	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	79%	52%	27%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	55%	20%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

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	72%	54%	18%	62%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	74%	57%	17%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	75%	51%	24%	53%	22%
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	51	50	43	47	44	25	50				
ELL	65	62		65	69						
HSP	70	68	54	68	70	46	79				
MUL	74	64		78	86						
WHT	81	69	43	86	76	65	88				
FRL	61	60	47	62	64	45	79				
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	46	54	40	55	46		50				
ELL	67			61							
HSP	75	71		70	50		69				
MUL	76	70		68	40		67				
WHT	80	76	53	77	58	35	77				
FRL	53	50	45	61	46		54				
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	53	63	56	49	60	44	46				
ELL	56			75							
ASN	100	92		95	92						
BLK	64			64							
HSP	77	73		67	55	31	73				
MUL	76	94		68	69						
WHT	75	65	49	76	66	38	76				
FRL	72	74	80	65	50	24	61				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
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	65
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	76
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	
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	73
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	60
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, the percentage of students who are in the bottom quartile performed the lowest in terms of learning gains for both Math (58%) and ELA (48%). The percentage of students who made gains for ELA for all students and bottom quartile students both fell by 6%.

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

Based off our data from the 2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment, the percentage of students in the bottom quartile making gains in ELA decreased by 6, in addition to the percentage of all students making gains decreased by 6, which would be the greatest need for improvement for grades 3, 4 and 5.

Based off our data from the 2022 Spring iReady diagnostic, the percentage of students who scored at the mid or above grade level placement was lowest in the area of Vocabulary (49%)

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 (specifically those in the bottom quartile) had gaps in learning with their foundational skills that impacted them meeting the grade level standards. Additional resources and strategies could be utilized to address the foundational needs of the students, beginning in Kindergarten. Data analysis at all grade levels would be impactful to make instructional decisions, including processes for MTSS. Considering additional SEL (through Guidance and Student Services Team) and Academic supports for the BQ students.

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

Based off our data from the 2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment, the percentage of students making Math Gains increased by 20, and the percentage of students in the bottom quartile making Math Gains increased by 16.

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

One of the contributing factors to this increase was the systematic use of data from the administration of the Math Monthly assessments. The use of data walls and cumulative insight into identifying the successes and barriers of the students assisted with small group instruction, and teachers used the data to address class-wide needs. ILT was leveraged in using the data to identifying instructional trends.

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

Continuing to utilize current data to determine the needs of the students, and to respond to that data using evidence based, small group, MTSS structures and processes. Utilizing resource map with Tier One, Two and Three interventions and progress monitoring documents. Vertical planning to ensure that grade levels are aware of the prerequisite skills from the previous year and the skills students will need to have in the future.

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

Professional development will be provided for teachers in the following areas:

1. K-5 support with understanding and implementing the new Math BEST Standards
2. 3-5 support with understanding and implementing the new ELA BEST Standards, and K-2 supports with year 2 implementation with ELA BEST Standards
3. Additional professional development for MTSS Resource Map
4. Training for data resources, such as School City, data wall, etc.
5. Use of data analysis resources (Data Chat resources, Standards Analysis, Data Reports)
6. Support with student data folders for accountability of students tracking and ownership of their data (through AVID goals)

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement, ongoing data analysis of all grade levels K-5 will be utilized with the development, support and follow up of goals and instructional implications.

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.

The greatest area of focus we determined was with our students in the Bottom Quartile for ELA, followed by our Bottom Quartile for Math. In addition, the percentage of all students making gains in ELA decreased.

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

85% of students will set goals based upon their progress monitoring assessments and track their own data by May 2023.

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

On a quarterly basis, teachers and administration will utilize student data tracking folder/binders to determine the percentage of students who are goal setting and tracking their data. ILT will identify the percentage of students who are goal setting and tracking their data on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Cronin (amber.cronin@hcps.net)

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

Using Hattie's work, self reported grades has an effect size of 1.44. In addition, student centered teaching (.54) and goals (.5) are high leverage strategies.

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

Self reported grades comes out at the top of all influences. Children are the most accurate when predicting how they will perform. In a video Hattie explains that if he could write his book Visible Learning for Teachers again, he would re-name this learning strategy "Student Expectations" to express more clearly that this strategy involves the teacher finding out what are the student's expectations and pushing the learner to exceed these expectations. Once a student has performed at a level that is beyond their own expectations, he or she gains confidence in his or her learning ability.

**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.

Professional Learning for teachers on Hattie's Barometer and Zone of Desired Effects and creation of student data folders to address self reported grades.

Person Responsible Amber Cronin (amber.cronin@hcps.net)

Parent engagement event for parents to understand the purpose behind and build support for the use of student data folders, and training and implementation for Student Led Conferences for the Spring Conference Night

Person Responsible Christina Duggins (christina.duggins@hcps.net)

Implementation of student data chats after District and State assessments by the teacher.

Person Responsible Amber Cronin (amber.cronin@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based upon our FSA data in Reading, we decreased in the percentage of students who made gains, and decreased in the percentage of bottom quartile students who made gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2023, small group instruction will be implemented with fidelity in 75% of the classrooms based upon walk through data.

Monitoring:

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

Regular walkthroughs and data collection by ILT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Cronin (amber.cronin@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Based upon Hattie's work and effect size, Response to Intervention (1.07) and Small group learning (.49)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Response to intervention (RTI) is an educational approach that provides early, systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of their learning. RTI seeks to prevent academic failure through early intervention and frequent progress measurement. Watch this video to learn more about Response to intervention.

Examples and more information for Response to intervention: www.interventioncentral.org

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.

Leveraging teachers who are comfortable and effective in small group instruction/MTSS for voluntary learning walks for teachers who would like to observe their practice in action.

Person Responsible

Amber Cronin (amber.cronin@hcps.net)

Professional development on the MTSS Resource Map and establishing a folder on Teams specific to MTSS, paperwork for teachers to access and drop in files.

Person Responsible

Amber Cronin (amber.cronin@hcps.net)

Professional Development on use of data to determine small groups, and implementation of small group instruction.

Person Responsible

Amber Cronin (amber.cronin@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

na

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

na

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)

na

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

na

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.

na

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

na

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?

na

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**

na

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.

Starting with our Positive Behavior Intervention Plan, the PBIP Committee will develop current structures and activities based on the data collected from pre-referral and referral forms. We have a Student Council set up - there are homeroom representatives that meet with and executive board to discuss and address needs as seen from the student point of view. We have a very strong PTA that will have a family event on a monthly basis to encourage parents to be on campus with their children in fun ways. Administration maintains an open door policy where parents are able to see us with respect to our planned and unplanned classroom visits.

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

Students through student council.

Teachers through ILT and Steering Committee.

Parents through their advocating for their children and participating in events that support the school.