

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mckitrick Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mckitrick Elementary School

5503 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Allison Cline

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2008

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	13%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (83%) 2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Mckitrick Elementary School

5503 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	13%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

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 believe in nurturing talent, imagination, and life-long learning. We believe in teachers that engage with innovation and effectiveness. We believe in a balance between independence and collaboration. We believe in educating for the future. We believe in children.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be provided equitable experiences which build their foundation for intellectual and social growth. Our mission is to develop a positive learning community where everyone succeeds.

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
Cline, Allison	Principal	Oversee goals and implementation of strategies to insure student growth. Monitor data to support and adjust instructional goals as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/2/2008, Allison Cline

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.*

9

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

956

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

0

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	8	10	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

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	130	135	172	177	216	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	998
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	10	10	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
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	3	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	8	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	130	135	172	177	216	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	998
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	10	10	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
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	3	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	8	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	89%	53%	56%				89%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	82%						78%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						71%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	92%	50%	50%				85%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	86%						81%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	79%						60%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	59%	59%				79%	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	88%	52%	36%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	88%	55%	33%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	89%	54%	35%	56%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

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	86%	54%	32%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	57%	28%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2022					
	2019	85%	54%	31%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	79%	51%	28%	53%	26%
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	52	62	58	57	58	46	36				
ELL	91	91	93	91	81		75				
ASN	94	88		99	98		97				
BLK	71	82		94	90						
HSP	83	85	79	89	81	77	76				
MUL	87	76		90	88		88				
WHT	90	80	71	91	85	78	78				
FRL	78	68	70	81	69	67	67				

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	38			40							
ELL	89			81							
ASN	97	73		97	82		83				
BLK	75			69							
HSP	85	58	50	81	56	36	68				
MUL	90			87							
WHT	82	68	43	85	72	57	73				
FRL	72	54		66	50		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	46	59	50	46	60	52	42				
ELL	71	82		79	82						
ASN	98	89		95	89		87				
BLK	90	76		70	76						
HSP	83	80	58	81	80	59	77				
MUL	84	56		84	78						
WHT	89	77	74	86	81	60	81				
FRL	79	76	81	77	82	78	79				

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	84
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	89
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	672
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	87
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	95
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	84
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	81
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	86
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	82
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	71
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?

Learning gains in ELA increased from 67% (2021) to 82% (2022). Learning gains in Math increased from 69% (2021) to 86% (2022).

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

Data will focus on the maintaining/increasing gains in both math and ELA bottom quartile, maintaining at a minimum the 73% learning gains in ELA and the 79% learning gains in Math.

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

Continue to focus on same strategies that increased our bottom quartile performance by 27% in ELA and 29% in Math.

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

Bottom Quartile in learning gains which was our SIP focus.

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

Teacher focused on progress monitoring using IReady, small group instruction and additional support for students. Data was reviewed to identify trends in PLCs and learning was accelerated in order to fill deficits.

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

Whole group instruction with small group settings as needed. Progress monitoring using a variety of instruments including PM1, PM2 & PM3. Teacher anecdotal notes along with teacher created assessments, fidelity in the MTSS process with focus on bottom quartile.

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.

Teachers had BEST training for new curriculum, teachers will have opportunity to visit other classrooms and identify successful strategies and use of data in PLCs and common planning. Teachers will have

opportunity to participate in the "Behavior Bootcamp" for strategies to develop student behaviors that support engagement and active learning!

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

PLC Facilitators and Instructional Leadership Team will review and support data drive instruction. Teachers will meet to determine student needs and develop strategies and interventions that meet the needs of students. Administration will provide feedback with walkthroughs and observations.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Due to the inconsistent fluctuation of student achievement for the bottom quartile in both math and ELA, a focus will on maintaining/increasing significant gains in both.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will continue to maintain or increase the bottom quartile in math at 79%+ and the bottom quartile in EL at 73%+.

Monitoring:

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

PLC led data review for trends and discussions of action steps implemented to increase outcomes. Student progress in MTSS process and teacher collaboration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

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

We will use high level strategies such as close reading, reciprocal teaching and student lead discussions to increase meta-cognitive and comprehension skills through a wide variety of rich & relevant Text to build background knowledge and increase student engagement. Acceleration during small group reading instruction to address unfinished learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Using the above referenced strategies in the previous year, student achievement increase by 27% in ELA and 29% in Math.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

Based on the 2022 Insight Survey, Professional Development had an overall rating of 4.8/10.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase Insight Survey Professional Development to an overall score of a minimum of 7/10.

Monitoring:

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

Professional Development will be offered using surveys to determine areas of focus for development.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

ILT will provide differentiated professional development based on district initiatives, school wide needs and teacher surveys.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers are motivated and engaged in Professional Development (PD) when they play a role in determining course of action with regard to selection of Professional Development opportunities.

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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Climate and School Culture

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

Due to data contained in the Insight Survey, we will focus on student behavior and well being.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There will be a decrease in behavior tracker incidents and an increase in teacher satisfaction on the Insight Survey. We will adjust and update behavior plans as needed.

Monitoring:

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

Behavior data will be monitored quarterly to determine effectiveness of interventions. The end of year Insight Data will be reviewed to determine success and teacher satisfaction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Monitoring of students with behavior data and success of strategies utilized.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Improvement of student behavior will allow for increase in student engagement that can lead to student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

RAISE Program does not apply.

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

RAISE Program does not apply.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:

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

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

NA

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

- *Open House/Meet and Greet
- *New Family Meet and Greet
- *Curriculum Nights
- *Math Night
- *Literacy Night
- *Health/Safety Fair
- *Kindergarten Art Display
- *Grandparents Day
- *Spring Festival
- *All-Pro Dads Monthly Meetings
- *Conference Nights/Bi-Annually
- *PTA Family Fun Nights/Bi-Annual
- *Monthly Character Awards Assembly
- *4th/5th Annual NJHS Induction Night
- *Fall/Spring Clubs
- *PTA Volunteer/Tutor Training
- *Student Mentor Program
- *Student Council
- *Talent Show
- *SEL Curriculum Lessons
- *Big Buddies
- *Martinez/McKitrick Monthly Meetings
- *Safety Patrol
- *7 Mindsets

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

Liisa DiTarando
 Lauren Arnold
 Debbie Draper
 Brooke Leske
 Kelsey Jones
 Breann Alderman
 Jennifer Abbett
 Kimberly Olson
 Tiffany Behnke
 Kristian Brown

Maria Schaus
Aimee Kennedy