

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lockhart Elementary Magnet 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

Lockhart Elementary Magnet School

3719 N 17TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: **Corey Jackson**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Lockhart Elementary Magnet School

3719 N 17TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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	95%

School Grades History

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

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.

Provide Rigorous Instruction for Disciplined Excellence

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare students to be critical thinkers, problem solvers, and responsible members of society

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
Corsanico, Natalie	Principal	Oversees the full function of the school from the building, safety, as well as systems and programs to ensure student learning.
Bell, Shalanda	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader, Assessment Coordinator, Manager of Schedules, assists Principal in all other Duties.
McGregor, Megan	Magnet Coordinator	Oversees Instruction of STEM, Coordinates Schoolwide Science improvement, provides coaching to teachers
Merrill, Kara	Instructional Coach	RTI Resource Teacher - oversees the schoolwide MTSS process; ensures schoolwide interventions are in place for Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 students, provides coaching to teachers
Witt, Stacey	Reading Coach	Reading Instructional leaders, plans and coaches teachers, uses data to inform data chats and instruction.
Shanteloo, Jasmine	Math Coach	Math Academic Leader; facilitates Content, Planning, and Data PLC, completes coaching cycles with teachers, and supports math learning of teachers and students

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/7/2021, Corey Jackson

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

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

370

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.

5

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	47	57	56	75	53	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	347
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	14	24	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	26	24	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
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	1	2	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	53	53	61	58	59	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	341
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	16	15	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	2	7	9	16	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	4	10	15	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	15	27	23	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	35	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	53	53	61	58	59	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	341
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	16	15	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	2	7	9	16	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	4	10	15	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	15	27	23	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	35	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	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	32%	53%	56%				29%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						33%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						47%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	35%	50%	50%				30%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						40%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						42%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	59%	59%				28%	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	23%	52%	-29%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	24%	55%	-31%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	57%	-24%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	60%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	26%	51%	-25%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	10	50	60	10	39	48	12				
ELL	33			25							
BLK	28	57	58	34	59	54	20				
HSP	50			42							
FRL	31	62	61	33	60	58	21				
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	16	25		14	17		10				
ELL	45			18							
BLK	25	46	58	27	34	18	17				
HSP	82			45							
FRL	29	50	54	30	42	17	26				
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	12	37	50	12	28	36	11				
ELL	47			41							
BLK	23	30	44	26	39	43	27				
HSP	42	41		46	53		45				
FRL	26	31	47	27	37	38	25				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33

Students With Disabilities	
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	44
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
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?

ELA: 3rd Prof 24%; 4th Prof 30%, Gains 47%, BQ Gains 46%; 5th Prof 43%, Gains 78%, BQ 78%
 Math: 3rd Prof 38%, 4th Prof 40%, Gains 53%, BQ 53%; 5th Prof 28%, Gains 69%; BQ Gains 67%
 Science: 5th Prof 28%

While Lockhart made significant gains last year moving the school grade from a D to a C, proficiency still remains and area for improvement. Additionally, our ESSA subgroup SWD (students with Disabilities) remains below 41% students making gains.

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

Lockhart needs to continue to push students to proficiency in Reading and Mathematics across all grade levels.

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 still have learning loss from the pandemic. Our students in grades 1-5, although in a much better place academically then they were in previous years, are still suffering the effects of losing instruction and foundational learning in their primary grades. So as they progress through the grade levels teachers are needing to fill in gaps in learning.

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

The most improvements were found in students making gains in the areas of Reading and Mathematics, as well as the lowest 25% of scoring students on FSA making gains.

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

As a school we used data to inform our instruction, planned in PLCs, empowered students through data chats to make and celebrate incremental gains. This allowed students to gain confidence and competence throughout the year.

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

This year Lockhart is implementing the new B.E.S.T. standards in grades K-5. Our coaches, teachers, and staff will grow throughout the year as they engage in Content PLCs to backwards plan from the standards. Additionally, teacher teams will plan with coaches and implement the B.E.S.T. standards and Wonders curriculum for Reading, and STEMscopes for Math.

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.

Content PLCs will be held every 3-6 weeks for Reading and Math.
Observations for school wide trend data will inform PD.
B.E.S.T. Standards PD will occur throughout the school year based on trend data.
Small Group instruction PD will be provided to provide a system and structure for small group.
Coaching Cycles will occur in all content areas with coaches.
Data Chats and Data Action Planning will inform instruction and student intervention.
Student Data Chats will be implemented to ensure student ownership over learning, as well as building confidence and competence.

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

The MTSS system at Lockhart has been revamped to be more efficient, effective, and supportive to teachers and students. This will ensure students on Tiered MTSS plans are receiving just in time intervention to support their on grade level learning.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Description: Student achievement will increase by establishing an collaborative culture through PLCs to implement and plan high-quality instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards.

Rationale: With the launch of the BEST standards, we want to ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the standards and how to use them to effectively plan student instruction. Additionally, we recently adopted new curriculum. Implementing a system for backwards planning.

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

By December 2022, at least 70% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to be engaged in standards aligned tasks. By Spring 2023, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to be engaged in standards aligned tasks.

As a result, student data will show:

At least 41% of students (3rd-5th) will be proficient in Reading as evidenced by scoring in the on level or above category on the Spring PMA 2023.

This will be monitored through observation and feedback through the year.

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

1. Collect trend data K-5 to inform PD.
2. Launch PD (either in planning sessions or whole group depending on the need)
3. Initiate Safe Practice - time for teachers to practice with coaches to implement PD
4. Observation and feedback by admin and coaches to inform next steps (which teachers require more support, which teachers are strong examples of implementation to model)
5. Provide more intensive support to teachers who need it.
6. Follow up with another session of walkthroughs and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

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

Hattie's 2018 updated list of factors related to student achievement: 252 influences and effect sizes

Content and Planning PLCs - promote collective teacher efficacy (1.57 effect size); Cognitive task analysis (1.29); promoting student discussion (.82 effect size)

Students Data Chats - self-reported grades (1.33 effect size); Self-efficacy (.92 effect size)

Teachers Data Chats - teachers making predictions about achievement (1.29 effect size); Response to intervention (1.29 effect size);

Scaffolding (.82 effect size)

Observation and Feedback to monitor the transfer of practice (.86 effect size)

Safe Practice - deliberate practice for teacher to implement new strategies from PD with support of coaches (.79 effect size)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for

At Lockhart if we are going to spend time implementing a School Improvement Plan it needs to be on high leverage actions that are proven to produce results.

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the 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.

K-5 teachers will participate in collaborative internalization content PLCs to deepen teachers content knowledge of upcoming standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

K-5 teachers will attend and be empowered to facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions to align the lessons with the grade level standards.

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@hcps.net)

K-5 teachers will participate in Data Driven PLCs after assessments to inform their instruction. Data chats and goals will be set with each student.

Person Responsible Natalie Corsanico (natalie.corsanico@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

K-2 teachers will participate in collaborative Reading/ELA internalization PLCs to deepen content knowledge of B.E.S.T. standards, plan weekly with grade level PLCs, and DAT Chat PLCs to drive instruction and intervention.

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

3-5 teachers will participate in collaborative Reading/ELA internalization PLCs to deepen content knowledge of B.E.S.T. standards, plan weekly with grade level PLCs, and DAT Chat PLCs to drive instruction and intervention.

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)

At least 41% students in grades k-2 will be proficient in Reading as evidenced by scoring on or above level on the Spring PLA standards aligned assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

At least 41% students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in Reading as evidenced by scoring on or above level on the Spring PLA standards aligned assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through observation and feedback through the year.

1. Collect trend data K-5 to inform PD.
2. Launch PD (either in planning sessions or whole group depending on the need)
3. Initiate Safe Practice - time for teachers to practice with coaches to implement PD
4. Observation and feedback by admin and coaches to inform next steps (which teachers require more support, which teachers are strong examples of implementation to model)
5. Provide more intensive support to teachers who need it.
6. Follow up with another session of walkthroughs and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Corsanico, Natalie, natalie.corsanico@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?

Hattie's 2018 updated list of factors related to student achievement: 252 influences and effect sizes
Content and Planning PLCs - promote collective teacher efficacy (1.57 effect size); Cognitive task analysis (1.29); promoting student discussion (.82 effect size)

Students Data Chats - self-reported grades (1.33 effect size); Self-efficacy (.92effect size)

Teachers Data Chats - teachers making predictions about achievement (1.29 effect size); Response to intervention (1.29 effect size); Scaffolding (.82 effect size)

Observation and Feedback to monitor the transfer of practice (.86 effect size)

Safe Practice - deliberate practice for teacher to implement new strategies from PD with support of coaches (.79 effect size)

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?

Yes the evidence-based programs address the n=identified need as they build teacher and student capacity.

The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population as shown by their high effect size.

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 Leadership: Literacy learning is prioritized by the admin and leadership team. Literacy instruction will be strategically focused on across all subject areas, through the building of vocabulary and content knowledge.	Corsanico, Natalie, natalie.corsanico@hcps.net
Literacy Coaching: Teachers will participate in collaborative internalization content PLCs with the literacy coach to deepen teachers content knowledge of upcoming standards-based instruction. Teachers will attend and be empowered with the assistance of the literacy coach to facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions to align the lessons with the grade level standards.	Corsanico, Natalie, natalie.corsanico@hcps.net
Assessments: Teachers will participate in Data Driven PLCs after assessments to inform instruction and engage students in goal setting and data chats.	Corsanico, Natalie, natalie.corsanico@hcps.net
Professional Learning: PD will be provided for literacy learning throughout the year. As PD rolls out around the BEST standards and teacher practice for the literacy block, teachers will be provided implementation support, modeling, coaching cycles, and feedback regularly to ensure students are provided the needed support to increase their reading proficiency.	Corsanico, Natalie, natalie.corsanico@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.

Students' achievement will increase by strengthening our schoolwide positive support system to ensure instruction time is maximized.

K-5 Teachers will implement the School Wide Cougar P.R.I.D.E. Expectations and Cougar Celebration Plan with fidelity and implement daily Morning Huddles to continue to strengthen strong Tier 1 systems.

All staff will implement Lockhart's Check and Connect system for identified students receiving Tiers 2 and 3 support.

Teacher and parental communication will be strengthened through PBIS rewards system.

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

Admin Team - Informs and facilitates teams

School Culture Team (admin, academic services team, student services team, classroom teachers, ESE resource teachers, paras) - Created Lockhart's Tier 1 PBIS Plan

PSLT - informs schoolwide PD needs based on needs assessment and schoolwide data trends

Student Services/MTSS B Facilitators- monitors behavior data and provides support to teachers for Tier 2 & Tier 3 students identified as needing greater behavior supports, meets with teacher teams.

Grade level teacher teams - implement and monitor student behavior plans, communicates and works with student's families to ensure the success of the student.

Mentoring Program (community partners) - meet with students to do check and connect

Teachers - Check-in/Check-out support for Tier 2 & 3 students (families are a part of the process)

FBA Team - Meets to create FBAs for students needing Tier 3 behavior support (families are a part of the process)