

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

1721 N MACDILL AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Denyse Rive IR O

Start Date for this Principal: 1/2/2006

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 45%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (76%)<br>2018-19: A (71%)<br>2017-18: A (70%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](http://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

---

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

## Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

1721 N MACDILL AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | No                     | 45%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 68%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

We cultivate in each student the desire to grow in wisdom, to nurture an open and curious mind, and to serve others with a generous spirit.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to create an advanced elementary program where students become aware of the shared humanity that binds all people together and develop respect for the variety of cultures and attitudes that add to the richness of life.

### 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   |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Riveiro, Denyse | Principal           | Instructional leader to oversee instruction, physical plant, and faculty and staff effectiveness.   |
| Hartle, Angela  | Magnet Coordinator  | IB Curriculum specialist to oversee delivery of magnet theme. Coordinator of schoolwide events, field trips, guest speakers. Marketing manager. |
| Bode, Teresa    | Assistant Principal | Instructional leader, behavior management, assessment coordinator, and logistics manager.   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 1/2/2006, Denyse Rive IR O

**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.*

17

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

34

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

384

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

4

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

6

**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                              | 57          | 73 | 71 | 65 | 57 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 380   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 1           | 4  | 5  | 3  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| 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  | 4  | 3  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 1  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 0  | 3  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |

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

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

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| 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**

Friday 8/12/2022



**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 71          | 69 | 68 | 62 | 57 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 388   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| 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  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 2  | 2  | 3  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| 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                              | 71          | 69 | 68 | 62 | 57 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 388   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| 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  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 2  | 2  | 3  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

#### 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

#### 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 78%    | 53%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 82%    | 52%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 72%    |          |       |        |          |       | 64%    | 55%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 70%    |          |       |        |          |       | 47%    | 50%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 81%    | 50%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 84%    | 54%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 82%    |          |       |        |          |       | 78%    | 57%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 77%    |          |       |        |          |       | 58%    | 46%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 72%    | 59%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 84%    | 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 | 83%    | 52%      | 31%                        | 58%   | 25%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 82%    | 55%      | 27%                        | 58%   | 24%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -83%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 81%    | 54%      | 27%                        | 56%   | 25%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -82%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 78%    | 54%      | 24%                        | 62%   | 16%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 84%    | 57%      | 27%                        | 64%   | 20%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -78%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 91%    | 54%      | 37%                        | 60%   | 31%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -84%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 84%    | 51%      | 33%                        | 53%   | 31%                     |
| 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                                       | 31       | 40     |             | 40        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 57       | 60     |             | 71        | 76      |              | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 93       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 75       | 80     |             | 76        | 81      |              | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 68       | 64     | 69          | 73        | 78      | 76           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 79       |        |             | 79        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 91       | 79     |             | 89        | 84      |              | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 68       | 69     | 63          | 71        | 80      | 77           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 46       |        |             | 46        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 54       | 60     |             | 77        | 90      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 87       | 100    |             | 96        | 100     |              | 100      |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 59       |        |             | 59        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 68       | 50     |             | 70        | 72      |              | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 70       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 95       | 64     |             | 88        | 93      |              | 100      |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 62       | 41     | 20          | 63        | 58      | 45           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 73       |        |             | 73        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 73       | 68     |             | 77        | 74      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 90       | 58     |             | 98        | 84      |              | 80       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 77       | 73     |             | 61        | 67      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 60     | 57          | 73        | 64      | 45           | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 88       | 69     |             | 91        | 86      | 82           | 95       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 75       | 64     | 59          | 72        | 68      | 54           | 80       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 74  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 63  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 595 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |      |
|--|------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8    |
| Percent Tested   | 100% |
| Subgroup Data  |      |
| Students With Disabilities   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 42   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0    |
| English Language Learners  |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 64   |
| 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   | 97   |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0    |
| Black/African American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 75   |
| 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  | 71   |
| 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   | 79   |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO   |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 83  |
| 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                                | 70  |
| 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?

The overall trend in our iReady data shows a consistent increase in proficiency from fall to spring in all grade levels and across all subject areas.

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

In 2022 81% of our students were proficient in math and 78% proficient in ELA. Although these proficiency levels exceed the state and district levels, they do not exceed our school's pre-covid proficiency 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?

Our ELA and math proficiency levels are trending upward since pre-covid but the effects of e-learning and students not being in school, learning with other students can still be seen in the classroom. Collaboration and focusing skills were weakened during e-learning. We will renew our focus on SEM-R strategies and the Junior Great Books Inquiry model for reading. In math, we will have an increased focus on differentiated, small group instruction using hands-on manipulatives and authentic application.

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

In 2022, grade 4 math students increased from 75% proficiency to 93%. Most notably, our bottom quartile students making learning gains increased from 57% to 77%.

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

We saw the greatest impact from our morning math labs and ELP support in grades 4 and 5. These labs were driven by Math Monthly data. Groups were fluid, based on the needs of students and proficiency with specific standards.

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

We will need to identify time blocks in our schedule to dedicate to SEM-R/Jr Great Book sessions, and math labs. Learning experiences will need to allow for collaboration, student engagement, and reflection during one-on-one conferencing,

**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.**

SEM-R training and Jr. Great Books Inquiry model demonstrations.

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

We will continue our math labs and ELP services that have provided proven results.

**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 Differentiation

### Area of Focus

#### Description and

#### Rationale:

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

In 2022, 81% of our students were proficient in math and 78% proficient in ELA. Although these proficiency levels exceed the state and district levels, they do not exceed our school's pre-covid proficiency levels.

### Measurable

#### Outcome:

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

An increase in the number of level 3 students who are proficient in ELA and math.

### Monitoring:

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

Level 2 students will be identified early in the year and monitored through the use of a variety of assessments (iReady, district baseline and mid-year assessments, running records etc.) to monitor growth. In addition, participation in Extended Learning Program (ELP) and re-teach math labs will be monitored for these students. Wakthroughs will be used by the principal and assistant principal to ensure differentiated support of targeted students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Bode (teresa.bode@hcps.net)

### Evidence-based

#### Strategy:

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

We will renew our focus on SEM-R strategies and the Junior Great Books Inquiry model for reading. In math, we will have an increased focus on differentiated, small group instruction using hands-on manipulatives and authentic application in our math labs and classroom instruction. ELP services will also continue.

Rationale for Evidence-based

#### Strategy:

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

Using the accelerated model of on-grade level instruction, teachers have been trained in scaffold activities and use of multiple assessment checkpoints towards a learning outcome.

### 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.

Identify level 2 ELA and math students and their stretch goals.

**Person Responsible** Teresa Bode (teresa.bode@hcps.net)



During report card meetings and MTSS meetings, identify small group strategies and classroom practices to be used at each grade level.

**Person Responsible** Teresa Bode (teresa.bode@hcps.net)

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Data from the 2022 Student Insight Survey demonstrated a deficiency in emotional regulation and growth mindset.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

A decrease in the number of students indicating they struggle with emotional regulation and growth mindset on the Student Insight Survey

### Monitoring:

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

Monitor the number of students referred to guidance for self-regulation concerns. Monitor the student behavior reflection sheets and the ability for students to identify ways to grow and improve.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Teresa Bode (teresa.bode@hcps.net)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Provide social/emotional lessons and support to students and parents. Institute Appreciative Inquiry strategies in the classroom to promote positive thinking.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

A student's day is filled with strong academic instruction, leaving little time for social/emotional support. Targeting social/emotional activities and Appreciative Inquiry techniques for both students and parents will support families in regulating emotions and developing a positive growth mindset.

### 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***

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

In reflecting on the comments from evaluators at our most recent IB evaluation, it was noted that our school should further develop plans for delivering the IB Approaches to Learning Skills (Research skills, Communication Skills, Social Skills, Self-Management Skills, and Thinking Skills). These are lifelong learning skills that students will need to be successful in the 21st century.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

A completed scope and sequence of objectives across all grade levels K-5, relating to the IB Approaches to Learning Skills.

**Monitoring:**

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

Evidence will be present in the grade level IB planners through documentation of learning experiences that explicitly teach these soft skills and offer opportunities for authentic application.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Grade level teams will meet with the IB Coordinator weekly to add learning experiences to the IB planners and brainstorm ideas for the scope and sequence document. An online collaboration tool such as Padlet and/or Toddle will be used to capture ideas and ensure access by all stakeholders, including SAC.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Electronic collaboration tools allow for multiple stakeholders to participate in discussion and planning. Allocating time each week for dedicated IB meetings allows for a concentrated focus on reaching goals and meeting timeline expectations related to the task.

**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.

Create an online environment for collaboration and brainstorming of ideas related to teaching the Approaches to Learning Skills.

**Person Responsible** Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

Meet weekly in grade level teams to fine tune authentic learning experiences appropriate for each grade level relating to the Approaches to Learning Skills.

**Person Responsible** Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

Conduct a pilot of an IB electronic platform used to plan for and capture evidence relating to the development of IB Approaches to Learning Skills.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

## 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

N/A

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

N/A

### 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)

N/A

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

**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.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

**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?

N/A

**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**

N/A

**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.**

Our character education program sets the tone for building a positive school culture and environment at Macfarlane Park. The IB Learner Profile Traits that make up our character education program are: caring, thinker, risk-taker, open-minded, reflective, communicator, inquirer, knowledgeable, principled and balanced. Students identify these traits in literary characters, historical figures, and leaders of today. They also celebrate the traits in each other. Each month, students are recognized by their classmates for exhibiting the learner profile traits. In addition to using the learner profile traits to address equity among our students, we also celebrate the great diversity of our student population. Our IB units of inquiry are designed to allow opportunities to make global connections and for students to share their own cultural connections.

During preplanning this year, teachers were trained on the Appreciative Inquiry Model for improvement. This model emphasizes focusing on the positive, what's working, and strengths, rather than focusing on problems and the negative. Teachers are using this approach in their classrooms to encourage a growth mindset with students.

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

All stakeholders in the Macfarlane Park family play a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment. We have a very robust parent association who supports students through volunteering, event planning and funding teacher grants for student projects. Our administration and staff facilitate student participation in mindfulness activities in the classroom and schoolwide events. By focusing on Appreciative Inquiry, our students will treat each other and our school community with respect as they perform multiple acts of service throughout the year, not only as a class or a grade level, but also as individual students who see a need that they can address. Our IB Coordinator is responsible for training staff on culture-building strategies such as Appreciative Inquiry and providing follow-up support throughout the year.