Mintz Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mintz Elementary School

1510 HEATHER LAKES BLVD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Martin   Start Date for this Principal: 6/7/2022

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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%)
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

Mintz Elementary School

1510 HEATHER LAKES BLVD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

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

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 develop leadership potential in all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mintz will build relationships in a safe and supportive environment to create a community of engaged learners and leaders.

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
Martin, Kevin	Principal	Daily supervision of all academics, operations and security of the school.
Simmons, Precious	Assistant Principal	Daily supervision of all academics, operations and security of the school.
Turbee, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Lighthouse Team
Hays, Sheila	Teacher, K-12	Lighthouse Team
Howell, Beth	Instructional Media	Lighthouse Team
Savary, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Lighthouse Team
Velez, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	Lighthouse Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/7/2022, Kevin Martin

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

779

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

15

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

11

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	114	136	111	131	125	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	729
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	26	23	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
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	47	51	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	33	44	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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

Monday 8/22/2022

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	114	125	111	131	125	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	713
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	14	26	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	9	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	43	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	15	8	16	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	3	7	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	114	125	111	131	125	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	713
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	14	26	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	9	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	43	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	15	8	16	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	3	7	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	41%	53%	56%				54%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						53%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						49%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	50%	50%				61%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%						60%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						51%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	59%	59%				53%	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	58%	52%	6%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
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	14	26	21	24	51	38	9				
ELL	41	57	50	41	69		25				
BLK	37	41	45	43	59	46	19				
HSP	43	50	35	45	72	57	38				
MUL	43	47		59	87						
WHT	44	47		69	77		38				
FRL	37	42	40	45	67	48	22				

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	24	33		24	17		30				
ELL	38	38		43	54		14				
BLK	36	17		39	38		44				
HSP	50	44		45	25	10	22				
MUL	57			65							
WHT	52	52		44	29		30				
FRL	42	36	48	40	28	20	27				

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	17	38	38	34	35	29	19				
ELL	38	48	57	53	60	50	38				
ASN	87			80							
BLK	45	53	46	55	56	48	40				
HSP	51	48	47	57	57	52	48				
MUL	71	56		62	69		82				
WHT	57	59	67	71	65	50	71				
FRL	49	51	49	56	56	50	49				

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

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

Black/African American Students

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
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	53
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	59
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	55
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA gains increased 8 points, BQ gains decreased by 7 points. Math gains were up 40 points with BQ gains up 27 points. Science proficiency decreased by 2 points to 32%. SWD continues to be an ESSA sub-group. ELA scores showed 14% proficient, 26% making gains and 21% of those in the BQ making gains. Math scores for SWB showed 24% proficient, 51% making gains and 38% of those in the BQ making gains. Science proficiency data shows 9% of SWD earning a proficient score.

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

ELA gains and BQ gains across all demographics and within the SWD subgroup need the greatest improvement. Math proficiency as well as gains are another area and science proficiency are also areas of greatest need.

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

While Mintz had 4 VE positions available, only two of those positions were filled so the logistics and caseload was the main barrier to student success. There were also side effects of dealing with COVID cases throughout the year where the VE teachers were out and or had to help cover classes where general education teachers were out. This amounted to scheduling being a challenge and barrier to meet the needs of ESE students.

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

Math gains increased by 40 points and Math BQ gains increased 27 points.

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

Mintz was able to take advantage of additional coaching provided by the district. The math coach assisted with disaggregating data and using it to drive collaborative planning for instruction.

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

All students need to be exposed to on grade level material in all subjects, and then those needing scaffolding or differentiation to access the on grade level materials be provided that. Grade level teams need to work together to collaboratively plan and strategize how they are going to get each and every student from their point A to their point be in the current academic year. Effective progress monitoring needs to be implemented so that students know what their goals are and get the support they need to reach those goals.

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.

Professional Development that will need to be a focus this year would be BEST standards training, specifically within ELA. The training needs to focus on unpacking the standards and using them to drive instruction which needs to be planned for as collaborative units. A focus on using the Science planning guides, progress monitoring in science and the use of 'Evidence of Learning Notebooks' will be a focus of PD as well.

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

Mintz is a RAISE school as designated by FLDOE as our proficiency (3+) on the end of year ELA assessment is less than 50%. Our math coach will focus on standards based planning and instruction and will help with the creation and progress monitoring of our data wall. We will use the expertise of the district science coach to use science planning guides and progress monitoring strategies.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	There are significant gaps between our SWD students overall scores as reported in the school's 2021-2022 ELA FSA data. Overall, SWD students performed at 14% proficiency with 26% showing a gain and 21% of the SWD students in the bottom quartile showing gains. These are deficit gaps of 27%, 20% and 20% respectively. FSA Math data shows that SWD students performed at 24% proficiency with 51% making gains and 38% in the bottom quartile making gains. These are deficit gaps of 25%, 18% and 9% respectively. 5th grade Science data showed 9% of SWD students showing proficiency which is a 21 point gap.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	SWD students will perform at 51% proficiency in ELA and math as well as 100% making gains and 100% of the bottom quartile making gains. Science proficiency for the SWD sub-group will increase from 9 to 35%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor student progress monitoring data to ensure students are moving towards the goal. Additionally, classes will use WIGs with students so that they can monitor their own data and lead measures as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Leader in Me and 4 Disciplines of Execution
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	We will involve students by having them take ownership of their data and progress monitoring. Students will write their own goals with assistance from their teachers and monitor their progress towards those goals. This will improve the buy-in and personal accountability we want to instill in our students.

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

There will be a renewed focus on the strategies, systems and procedures of Leader in Me. Staff will take part in a refresher training during pre-planning and then there will be three additional PD and coaching sessions.

Person Responsible   Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

Through the RAISE program, PD will be delivered on standards based teaching training related to planning and implementation of on grade level standards.

Person Responsible   Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

Students will work with their ESE and Gen Ed teacher to regularly set and monitor goals.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. 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.	To meet the needs of all students in ELA and Math, we need to focus on teaching grade level standards to students. Students need grade level material to work with with appropriate differentiation and scaffolding to assist them in accessing the grade level standards at their level.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA proficiency scores will increase from 41 to 54% with 100% of students making their yearly gains/BQ gain. Math proficiency scores will increase from 50 to 55% with 100% of students making their yearly gain/BQ gain.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring will happen through our electronic data wall, physical data walls and review of of WIG and PLC agendas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Standards based planning and instruction Collaborative planning and Professional Learning Communities Leader in Me and 4 Disciplines of Execution
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students need to be taught grade level standards. They need to be presented the standards at their grade level with differentiation and scaffolding as needed to help them access the standard. Through Leader in Me and 4DX, students will develop self-accountability and good habits to reach the goals they set for themselves with the assistance of their teacher. Through PLCs and collaborative planning, teacher can be ready to teach 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.

Lighthouse team members will lead their PLC and planning session on a minimum bi-weekly basis. In addition to planning, PLCs will monitor progress data and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible   Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

Teachers will take part in quarterly Leader in Me training to include 4 Disciplines of Execution.

Person Responsible Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

Administration will work with instructional staff to identify model classrooms for standards based instruction in ELA and Math as well as model classroom for Leader in Me Morning Meetings and implementation of the 7 Habits.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	5th grade science scores indicate 32% of students earning a 3 or better proficiency achievement score. This will be addressed as a K-5 opportunity to improve upon.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Science proficiency will increase from 32 to 54% as measured by the 2023 state science assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student data will be tracked and monitored through our electronic data wall to include beginning and mid-year district science assessments. Fidelity in the use of district provided long term investigations will be monitored as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The Lighthouse Team and our science coach will work with teams to use active thinking strategies in all grade levels. The use of 'Evidence of Learning Notebooks' (formerly interactive notebooks) will be a focus as well as grade level science specific vocabulary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Based on conversation with our district science coach, we determined that the fundamentals of science instruction need to be strengthened as a school. By providing guidance on the sue of planning guides, teaching active thinking and progress monitoring Mintz will be able to increase the percentage of proficient science 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.

Provide all teachers with a review of the instructional planning guides and how to use the resources embedded in them. This will include an explanation of what is included in the weekly science spotlight and how they can help improve science instruction.

Person Responsible	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

Implement a data based progress monitoring system. Students will use their own data trackers. K-3 will utilize the mini-assessments and grades 4 and 5 will use the quarterly science assessments. Admin will progress monitor through a data wall.

Person Responsible	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

Teachers and students will focus on the use of active thinking strategies through the first grading period,.

Person Responsible	Kevin Martin (kevin.martin@hcps.net)

Teachers and students will implement and use 'Evidence of Learning' notebooks. Time will be taken to create and teach to learn how to use the notebooks during the first grading period. Consistent use of the notebooks will be the focus staring with the 2nd grading period through the end of the school year.

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

Standards based instruction based on data-driven collaborative planning. Professional learning communities focusing on progress monitoring data. Use of structures and strategies embedded in the Leader in Me program as well as the 4 Disciplines of Execution.

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

Standards based instruction based on data-driven collaborative planning. Professional learning communities focusing on progress monitoring data. Use of structures and strategies embedded in the Leader in Me program as well as the 4 Disciplines of Execution.

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)

As measured by iReady diagnostic reading data, 100% of K,1,2 students will show a minimum of one year's academic growth.
As measured by walk through data, 80% of teachers will engage students in standards-based instruction and grade-level assignments at the complexity level of the standard or higher by October 31, 2022.
As measured by walk through data, 100% of teachers will engage students in standards-based instruction and grade-level assignments at the complexity level of the standard or higher by December 31, 2022.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percentage of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade student earning a 3+ on the end of year state assessment will increase from 41% to 51% in May 2023.
As measured by walk through data, 80% of teachers will engage students in standards-based instruction and grade-level assignments at the complexity level of the standard or higher by October 31, 2022.
As measured by walk through data, 100% of teachers will engage students in standards-based instruction and grade-level assignments at the complexity level of the standard or higher by December 31, 2022.

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.

Administration and grade level PLC groups will progress monitor data using student data trackers as well as electronic data walls. Administration and the Lighthouse Team will monitor walk through data on a monthly basis.

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

Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@hcps.net

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teachers will engage in collaborative planning for standards based instruction. The protocol will enable them to use data to drive instruction and provide grade-level texts for student to access There will be school-wide, classroom and student data tracking using the 4 Disciplines of Execution. Leader in Me structures and protocols will engage students in taking ownership of their learning and goals.

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?

The goal is to strengthen teacher instructional practice as they relate to standards based instruction. By combining this with student ownership and effective goal setting and monitoring student achievement and student gains will increase.

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
Administration will work with our Just Read Florida FLDOE contact to conduct initial literacy walk throughs and compile positives, deltas and to identify probable instructional priorities.	Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@hcps.net
Lighthouse Team members from K/1/2 and 3/4/5 will take part in a PD to use a collaborative planning protocol that will guide their planning moving forward. The PD will be separate for each grade band.	Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@hcps.net
Administration will work with Lighthouse Team members to create expectations and procedures for PLC/WIG meetings.	Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@hcps.net
Administration will provide ongoing progress monitoring through classroom walkthroughs and observational data to validate our progress towards the goals.	Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@hcps.net
Students will be provided targeted support through our Extended Learning Program (ELP).	Simmons, Precious , precious.simmons@hcps.net
Family engagement will be addressed through out Title 1 meeting as well as a literacy family night event.	Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@hcps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Mintz Elementary is a Leader in Me school. The program is based on the 7 Habits of Effective People and the 4 Disciplines of Execution. Students are taught to be leaders which includes being a good and productive citizen. Students organize and lead recognition and celebrations. Students learn to self-advocate and to track their own data to include lead and lag measures.

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

The Lighthouse Team is charged with the implementation of Leader in Me structures and overall program. Student services will work to create events such as Red Ribbon Week, Start With Hello and Great American Teach In to help build community. Students will be able to earn Mintz Moola which they can trade in for various incentives which can be from their teacher or school wide events such as a glow party or BMX event.