Lomax Magnet Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lomax Magnet Elementary School

4207 N 26TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Jacobsen Capps

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%)
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

Lomax Magnet Elementary School

4207 N 26TH 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 KG-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	98%

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.

Lomax will build a community of active thinking and learning citizens through exploration, enrichment, electives and expeditions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Lomax community will develop the individual talents and strengths of each child.

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
Jacobsen Capps, Sarah	Principal	
Barr, Katrina	Assistant Principal	
Fruchey, Jennifer	SAC Member	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/2/2021, Sarah Jacobsen Capps

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
16

Total number of students enrolled at the school
292

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
2

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	34	40	51	51	58	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	283
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	14	12	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	20	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	17	28	14	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	9	5	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	1	9	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	40	47	49	54	49	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309
Attendance below 90 percent	14	12	12	15	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	40	47	49	54	49	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309
Attendance below 90 percent	14	12	12	15	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	38%	53%	56%				55%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						50%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						37%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	38%	50%	50%				54%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%						39%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						10%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	59%	59%				46%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	19	43	30	27	55		27				
ELL	58	70		50	91						
BLK	37	53	40	36	67	64	33				
HSP	21	43		22	64		20				
FRL	34	49	31	35	65	61	30				

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	20	36		12	9						
ELL	57			33							
BLK	35	38	36	23	21	13	26				
HSP	40			35							
FRL	33	34	35	22	20	11	24				

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	14	30	25	23	19	16	11				
ELL	56	58		56	38						
ASN	77			100							
BLK	51	48	35	49	33	10	39				
HSP	60	52		57	41		50				
WHT	64	50		73	60						
FRL	47	45	33	46	29	11	33				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

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	67
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	47
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	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	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?

Based on an analysis of the data from 2019, 2021, and 2022, we see the following trends:
-Great increase in math gains from both 2019 and 2021 data.
-ELA has dropped since 2021, but has been stable in 2021 and 2022.
-Science increased 7% to 34% but still below prior years historical data. Science correlating with ELA proficiency.
-SWD subgroups made increased learning gains in ELA and Math, but continues to be below the 41% proficiency threshhold for 3 years.
-All school ELA proficiency at 38%, not yet meeting goal of 50%.
-ELL subgroup showed great increase in proficiency.

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

Increasing proficiency in ELA, Math and Science is our greatest need for improvement, with a targeted focus on our students with disabilities reaching proficiency. Additionally, we need to initiate a focus on our Hispanic subgroup due to a decrease in proficiency.

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

-While we saw an increase in learning gains in ELA for our students with disabilities, we did not see an increase in proficiency. We believe these gains are due to an increase in collaborative planning for acceleration implemented during the 21-22 school year.
-We did not see the increase in ELA that we saw in Math. However, prior Math gains were very low, allowing for more movement in the data.
-New actions include increased student ownership and demonstration of learning. This will be described in our strategies and action steps.

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

Math Proficiency and Learning Gains.
Science proficiency.
ELA Gains.

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

Standards aligned collaborative planning for both units and small group rotations greatly contributed to these gains. Teachers planned multiple days a week in teams and with content coaches to ensure teacher clarity and data based small group rotations to meet individual student needs.

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

While planning was successful, we know this level of planning needs to continue to increase the impact on student achievement. Additionally, we began a focus on student ownership later in the year during 21-22. Some impact was seen, but an intense focus on student ownership of their learning, and how they will demonstrate their learning within each lesson, each day, from the beginning of 22-23 will have an even greater impact on students reaching proficiency in ELA, Math and Science.

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.

-Planning for units and small groups will continue on a weekly schedule. The Academic Leadership Team will support and provide professional development through participation in planning.
-Teacher training on Student Clarity will occur in pre-planning and on an ongoing basis. Individual coaching cycles will occur with administration and content coaches regularly with a focus on our look-fors related to student ownership and demonstration of learning.

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

SAC Waiver approved for additional planning and PD hours (up to 4 additional hours per month for all instructional staff).
Building capacity through monthly meeting/PD with team leaders through the Instructional Leadership Team.
Focused systems around key lever instructional priorities allow for sustainability and greater impact.

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.**	While we saw great gains, we did not meet our goals for increasing ELA proficiency. According to reseach from John Hattie, we know that student ownership of their learning and how students demonstrate learning within the lesson will increase proficiency. This focus allows us to pay close attention to what the students are doing in the lesson, versus what the teacher is doing.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Through implementation of best practices for student ownership and demonstration of learning described in our look-fors, 75% of classroom walkthroughs will show 100% of the look-fors evident by April 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Classroom walkthroughs with feedback and coaching cycles will be reviewed in the Academic Leadership Team weekly. Student achievement on iReady, unit assessments, and quarterlies will be analyzed for impact on a schedule based on assessment dates in our Action Teams (ALT, ILT and grade level/content PLCs).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The strategy is to identify specific classroom best practice look-fors (what exactly should you see the students doing, and the teacher doing in instruction) related to student engagement. The look-fors are based on best practices outlined in our observation rubric, which align to research from John Hattie's visible learning related to teacher . Instructional rounds with feedback utilizing these look-fors will be completed weekly and determined by current student data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research from John Hattie (visible-learning.org) tells us that student ownership of their learning increases achievement. Additionally, when students have clarity in how they will demonstrate learning (i.e. an example, a rubric, clear criteria), they are able to check their own work based on this criteria, and provide feedback to their peers. We believe these research based strategies will increase interest, relevancy, and proficiency for our students.

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.

Develop specific look-fors based on this area of focus and strategy to be implemented in instructional rounds and coaching feedback cycles.

Person Responsible   Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

Implement systematic, outcome focused instructional rounds to be monitored (identify focus areas and analyze impact on student data) within action team meetings weekly (ALT, ILT, PLCs).

Person Responsible   Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

For our Students with Disabilities subgroup and our Hispanic subgroups not meeting the ELA proficiency expectation, we will conduct specific instructional rounds focused on these groups with data analysis to monitor the impact on student proficiency.

Person Responsible   Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

During monthly School Advisory Council meetings beginning in September, we will address strategies for engaging parents in increasing ELA proficiency.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fruchey (jennifer.fruchey@hcps.net)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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, 36% of K-2 students scored "on level" in Reading, and 50% of K-2 students scored "mid-year on grade leve" 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 6 week 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, 38% of 3rd-5th graders scored a level 3 or higher. Additionally, iReady Final Diagnostic in Spring 2022 shows 32% of students scoring "on level", and 53% of students scoring at "mid-year on grade level". 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 Academic 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 (all teachers have chosen to give diagnostic), checkpoints, unit assessments, FAST assessments.

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

Jacobsen Capps, Sarah, sarah.jacobsencapps@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.	Jacobsen Capps, Sarah, sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

At Lomax, there is a focus on building community through a team focus in our themes (for 21/22, Teamwork Makes the Dreamwork; for 22/23, Many Panthers, One PRIDE"). Additionally, in pre-planning, we implement professional development around the importance of building relationships with peer teachers, students, families, and the community. We utilize "PRIDE Notes" to give shout outs and positive support to one another. We are clear and consistent with our focus and expectations, using common language through our CHAMPS procedures and PRIDE expectations.

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

Stakeholders have a voice through a variety of opportunities to include leadership teams, surveys, and open communication. Over the last year, we have re-activated our PTA with an active parent board, tripled parent and community participation in our School Advisory Council, earned excellent instructional staff climate and culture surveys, and increased student leadership opportunities through patrols, green team and service club. Through our school based Action Teams, we have much more planned for the 22/23 year.