
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

Lopez Elementary School

200 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Zemenaye Harris

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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

Lopez Elementary School

200 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">65%</p>

School Grades History

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

To build strong relationships so ALL students become the best version of themselves.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To Center ALL 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
Jolly, Vanity	Assistant Principal	
Jauch, Gina	Instructional Coach	
Piccorelli, Rachel	Instructional Coach	
Piccorelli, Kaitlyn	Instructional Coach	
Harris, Zemenaye	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Zemenaye Harris

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

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

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

10

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

14

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	73	88	74	83	89	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	46	27	39	29	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	24	18	21	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	8	15	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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

Sunday 8/21/2022

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	88	71	83	96	70	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	18	10	16	7	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	31	40	23	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	1	0	3	12	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	88	71	83	96	70	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	18	10	16	7	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	31	40	23	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	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	1	0	3	12	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	53%	56%				51%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						46%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						23%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	50%	50%				54%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						59%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						47%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	59%	59%				43%	50%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	53%	-15%
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	33	52	31	30	34	29	9				
ELL	33	39		42	47	40	6				
BLK	46	62		47	45		21				
HSP	40	54	14	48	52	41	29				
MUL	56			69							
WHT	49	71	67	54	60	38	33				
FRL	44	59	43	50	55	41	32				

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	36	53		40	47		33				
ELL	30	44		35	56		8				
BLK	50	38		41	31		33				
HSP	40	48	40	43	56		25				
MUL	69			69							
WHT	52	65		57	39		48				
FRL	47	49	47	49	44	35	35				

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	41	46	28	38	52	46	29				
ELL	30	39		44	52		10				
BLK	41	41		41	56		23				
HSP	48	51	18	55	63	31	35				
MUL	47	46		53	77						
WHT	58	43	15	58	51	36	58				
FRL	49	47	21	50	58	48	43				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
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	49
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?

Across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas, our Lopez staff and students have room for growth in developing academic ownership and agency for all learners. According to our schoolwide panorama data, only 50% of our learners demonstrate self-efficacy (or belief in their own capacity), while a lesser 38% of our students responded favorably to being able to do “the hardest work” that is assigned in class. In contrast, while 78% of teachers describe our site as a place where there are many opportunities for students to have academic discussions, our schoolwide classroom observations indicate that less than 38% of our students showed academic ownership consistently across all content areas. This number increased 23 percentage points from the previous year, and while we celebrate the increase, we will continue to prioritize academic ownership as a vehicle for school improvement.

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

Based on our 2022 progress monitoring and state assessments, our greatest areas for growth in ELA is in cluster 1: Key Ideas and Details, as well as well as the proficiency and gains among our Students with Disabilities (SWD) and our English Language Learners (ELL). In Science, our students have declined across the course of the past few years, with struggle in the component: Nature of Science. In Mathematics our greatest domain in need of improvement is Measurement, Data, and Geometry for 3rd and 4th grade. In 5th grade our greatest domain in need of improvement is Operations, Algebraic Thinking, and Fractions. Our greatest area for growth for Math FSA proficiency levels and gains is among our SWD and our ELL.

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

The most significant contributing factors hindering the success of our SWD and ELL students were staffing shortages, reallocation of units, teachers in unfamiliar grade levels/content areas, student quarantines, and limited literacy home environments. Our students with specific learning disabilities and our students who are working to acquire a second language need a robust and print rich learning environment full of multidisciplinary approaches. As a result, our teachers and staff are working to identify and prioritize student needs, for the purpose of accelerating students toward the grade level standards, particularly in the area of key ideas/details and measurement/data/geometry. With regards to all content areas, but especially Science, we recognize the need for a balanced curriculum. We must provide a balance of content, integrating often, but also a balance in delivery models (i.e. exploration, teacher-directed, student-led dialogic discussion).

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

Based on our 2022 progress monitoring and state assessments, our greatest area of improvement in ELA was in overall learning gains. In Mathematics, our greatest area of improvement was in proficiency and overall learning gains.

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

This improvement is a direct result of a strengthened core, and targeted small groups. As a school, we've made an effort to target our tier 2 learners who need that additional push to reach proficiency. We've paired up support with specific students through ELP and small group instruction (within and outside of the classroom) for the purpose of noticing and naming specific student needs. We also initiated our focus on academic ownership for all learners. Whereas we've typically had a smaller pocket of students who believed they could do the hardest work, we've worked to develop a culture that all students, regardless of physical, intellectual, or emotional differences, can and will be successful.

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

Accelerating learning in reading is based off of 3 components: topic, standard, and strategy.

- At each level of student support (schoolwide, grade level, class, small group, individual), we can accelerate students by providing and developing agency with respect to reading topics. We can purposefully pair texts with learners to build necessary background knowledge, and instill in students the desire to seek out opportunities to connect ideas across texts, tasks, and content areas.
- Acceleration through standards requires careful consideration of standards to be mastered, and the prerequisite pieces necessary for success. By using learning ladders, instructors can identify which areas need more scaffolded support prior to teaching the targeted grade level standard(s).
- To accelerate learning through the use of strategies, instructors need to be focused and intentional in noticing literacy behaviors that are present, and implementing strategies that best support the learner in acquiring literacy behaviors not yet present so that whole reader is supported

In mathematics, the following components will be used to accelerate learning:

- Prerequisite and acceleration tasks are embedded in the StemScopes resources: Accessing Prior Knowledge and Foundational Skills.
- StemScopes uses real-world scenarios to explore mathematical concepts.
- Quarterly monitoring tools provide data that is interpreted to make instructional decisions.

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.

In addition to our schoolwide and content specific professional development, we will continue to implement two support structures that we established in the 2021-2022 school year. Teachers are provided with weekly opportunities to gather across the grade level, and with coaches and administrators to lesson plan. These sessions are focused on internalizing and applying best practices in instruction to build capacity among students. Acceleration begins with knowing where students are, where they need to go, and the steps we will take to get them there. To support the "knowing where they are", we have also developed opportunities for data chats, MTSS grade level discussions, and professional development by extending our 'specials' time to 50 minutes on Fridays. We believe that by developing a culture of student agency and academic ownership, we structure acceleration as a way of learning for students. We will do this by continuing to support teachers in the implementation of the subcategories of academic ownership (i.e. precise language, conversation structures, productive struggle).

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

To provide continuous improvement, we will maintain quality resource teachers (Math, Media, Reading, ESOL) and SEL (Social Emotional Learning) Team Members to develop a culture for learning that centers all students. We will do this through culturally responsive practices that prioritize student agency and academic ownership. Administration, along with these teams, will provide job embedded professional development through book studies, professional learning communities, learning walks, and coaching cycles with purposeful feedback. Our plan for sustainability involves growing the capacity of our staff through a focus on growth mindset.

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 Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Teachers will incorporate structures and strategies that encourage academic ownership. Based on the 2022 Math FSA score for grades 3-5, 52% scored at proficiency, 55% made learning gains, and 36% of Bottom Quartile made learning gains (ESSA subgroup proficiency: 30% SWD and 42% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students' academic ownership.

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

FAST Math proficiency will increase to 60 (+8 points)

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

Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our ESSA subgroup SWD and ELL students based on our instructional priorities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Jauch (gina.jauch@hcps.net)

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

Teachers will participate in a Professional Development to learn strategies that will enhance academic ownership to involve all learners during instruction. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach to design thought provoking questions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Based on the 2022 Math FSA score for grades 3-5, 52% scored at proficiency, 55% made learning gains, and 36% of Bottom Quartile made learning gains (ESSA subgroup proficiency: 30% SWD and 42% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students' academic ownership.

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.

- Weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach
- Quarterly Professional Development using the book Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain by Zaretta Hammond
- Ongoing opportunities for teachers to participate in Coaching Cycles, Side-by-Side Coaching, Learning Walks, and Leverage Leadership based on teacher needs.
- Ongoing feedback provided by administration based on look-fors

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Teachers will implement a common planning protocol to include opportunities for teacher clarity around targets and tasks that are aligned to the rigor of the standard. Based on the 2022 Math FSA scores, 52% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (ESSA subgroup: 30% SWD and 42% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards.

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

FAST Math proficiency will increase to 60 (+8 points)

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

Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our ESSA subgroup: SWD and ELL students based on our instructional priorities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Jauch (gina.jauch@hcps.net)

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

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach aligned to BEST Standards so they can deliver on grade level instructions to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Based on the 2022 Math FSA scores, Math FSA scores, 52% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (ESSA subgroup: 30% SWD and 42% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards.

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.

- Weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach
- Quarterly Professional Development using the book Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain by Zaretta Hammond
- Ongoing opportunities for teachers to participate in Coaching Cycles, Side-by-Side Coaching, Learning

Walks, and Leverage Leadership based on teacher needs.

- Ongoing feedback provided by administration based on look-fors

Person Responsible Vanity Jolly (vanity.jolly@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Teachers will aggressively monitor data to drive small group instruction and the skills in small group will address specific skill deficiencies. Based on the 2022 Math FSA score for grades 3-5, 55% made learning gains and 36% of bottom quartile made learning gains (ESSA subgroup learning gains: 34% SWD and 47% ELL. ESSA subgroup bottom quartile learning gains: 29% SWD and 40% ELL). This score was due to the lack of small group opportunities provided for students.

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.

FAST Math proficiency will increase to 60 (+8 points)

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

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

Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our ESSA subgroup SWD and ELL students based on our instructional priorities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Jauch (gina.jauch@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will participate in a Professional Development to learn how to monitor in the moment data to be responsive to students' needs. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach to plan for small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Based on the 2022 Math FSA score for grades 3-5, 55% made learning gains and 36% of bottom quartile made learning gains (ESSA subgroup learning gains: 34% SWD and 47% ELL. ESSA subgroup bottom quartile learning gains: 29% SWD and 40% ELL). This score was due to the lack of small group opportunities provided for 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.

- Weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach
- Quarterly Professional Development using the book Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain by

Zaretta Hammond

- Ongoing opportunities for teachers to participate in Coaching Cycles, Side-by-Side Coaching, Learning Walks, and Leverage Leadership based on teacher/student needs
- Ongoing feedback provided by administration based on look-fors

Person

Vanity Jolly (vanity.jolly@hcps.net)

Responsible

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

Teachers will implement a common planning protocol to include opportunities for teacher clarity around targets and tasks that are aligned to the rigor of the standard, academic ownership, and small group opportunities for students. Based on the 2022 ELA iReady scores, 42% of all students in grades K-2 scored at proficiency. This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards, academic ownership opportunities, and small group opportunities.

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

Teachers will implement a common planning protocol to include opportunities for teacher clarity around targets and tasks that are aligned to the rigor of the standard, academic ownership, and small group opportunities for students. Based on the 2022 ELA FSA scores, 46% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (ESSA subgroup learning gains: 52% SWD and 39% ELL ESSA subgroup bottom quartile learning gains: 31% SWD and 0% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards, academic ownership opportunities, and small group opportunities.

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)

FAST ELA proficiency will be 50

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

FAST ELA proficiency will increase to 50 (+4 points)

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.

Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development.

Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our ESSA subgroup SWD and ELL students based on our instructional priorities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Piccorelli, Rachel, rachel.piccorelli@sdhc.k12.fl.us

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?

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach aligned to BEST Standards as applicable so they can deliver on grade level instructions to students, plan for academic ownership, and small groups.

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?

Based on the 2022 ELA iReady scores, 42% of all students in grades K-2 scored at proficiency. This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards, academic ownership opportunities, and small group opportunities.

Based on the 2022 ELA FSA scores, 46% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (ESSA subgroup learning gains: 52% SWD and 39% ELL ESSA subgroup bottom quartile learning gains: 31% SWD and 0% ELL). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards, academic ownership opportunities, and small group opportunities.

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach •Quarterly Professional Development using the book Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain by Zaretta Hammond •Ongoing opportunities for teachers to participate in Coaching Cycles, Side-by-Side Coaching, Learning Walks, and Leverage Leadership based on teacher/student needs •Ongoing feedback provided by administration based on look-fors 	<p>Jolly, Vanity, vanity.jolly@hcps.net</p>

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.

- Restorative & Trauma-Sensitive Practices
- Relationship Building
- Structure and Predictability
- Social-Emotional Learning
- Emotion Regulation
- Restorative Language

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

Students, Caregivers, Teachers & Staff will promote a positive culture for students by.....

- participate in a Quarterly PD on building relationship using Being the Change: Lessons and Strategies to Teach Social Comprehension by Sara Ahmed
- building relationships with all stakeholders
- providing a structure with predictability
- embedding social-emotional learning in daily lessons
- explicitly teaching emotion regulation techniques
- using restorative language
- participating in family learning nights