

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Morgan Woods Elementary 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>

# Morgan Woods Elementary School

7001 ARMAND DR, Tampa, FL 33634

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Jessica Kepa**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%)
<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>	TSI
* 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>

# Morgan Woods Elementary School

7001 ARMAND DR, Tampa, FL 33634

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The Morgan Woods Elementary School community will provide opportunities for personal growth and academic success for all students.

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

Morgan Woods Elementary School will develop individuals who are capable of successfully meeting the challenges of the future.

### 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
Kepa, Jessica	Principal	The principal is responsible for ensuring a safe environment for learning, and serves as the instructional leader of the school building. The principal makes frequent observations, provides feedback, analyzes data and provides suggestions/resources for continued academic improvement.
Kurella, Carrie	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for ensuring a safe environment for learning, and serves as an instructional leader of the school building. The assistant principal makes frequent observations, provides feedback, analyzes data and provides suggestions/resources for continued academic improvement.
Farland, Janice	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chairperson

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/1/2019, Jessica Kepa

**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.*

0

**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.*

10

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

23

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

462

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

12

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

12

**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	70	81	61	90	65	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	437
Attendance below 90 percent	0	29	23	27	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	33	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	36	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	33	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

**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	2	6	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	3	12	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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	67	50	74	69	68	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	11	15	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	1	3	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	67	50	74	69	68	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	11	15	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	1	3	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	45%	53%	56%				45%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						46%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						43%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	43%	50%	50%				43%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						58%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						53%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	59%	59%				49%	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	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	31%	54%	-23%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
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	12	52	58	35	62		9				
ELL	38	63	61	38	59	45	36				
BLK	33			17							
HSP	43	65	60	44	60	46	38				
WHT	60	50		53	64						
FRL	42	61	55	40	59	42	35				
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	30	13		32	40		21				
ELL	42	46	50	32	27	36	26				
BLK	53			27							
HSP	46	44	38	35	27	31	33				
WHT	47			56							
FRL	47	48	38	34	25	21	35				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	37	33	27	48	50	14				
ELL	36	53	62	32	59	61	50				
BLK	31			23							
HSP	45	50	54	43	58	48	55				
WHT	47	36		44	58		31				
FRL	43	46	44	41	57	51	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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
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
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	57
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	50
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 data shows an increase in growth for all students and students in the bottom quartile, however overall achievement continues to trend below district and state data. The same is can be observed when reviewing data for mathematics. In this area, however overall gains increased dramatically in comparison with prior years.

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

Overall achievement in both ELA and Mathematics continues to be an area of focus. In addition, students in the Black and ESE subgroups did not make the same amount of progress as their grade level peers.

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

Students began the school year with significant gaps in learning, largely due to the impacts of COVID on the school community. Student attendance continued to be inconsistent and irregular throughout the school year as families continued to adjust to a post-pandemic lifestyle. With consistent, high-quality, on grade level instruction students will close the gap toward being proficient. In addition, the school will focus on student attendance.

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

Students making gains in mathematics showed the largest increase, moving from 29.5% making gains in 20-21 to 61% during the 21-22 school year.

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

Frequent progress monitoring checks were used to evaluate student progress in mathematics, with immediate instructional shifts made based on student data. Targeted small groups were pulled to address specific skill deficits. The Math Resource Teacher provided an additional layer of support during lunch bunches and after school ELP.

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

Instructional coaches will assist teams during collaborative planning to ensure grade level content is presented in a way that matches the intended rigor of the BEST standards. Frequent checks for understanding will be planned and implemented to ensure timely instructional adjustments are made. Teachers will use student data to plan small group instruction with differentiated support is required to assist students in working toward mastery.

**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.**

Teams will meet with instructional coaches at least twice monthly to collaboratively review grade level standards and plan instruction. PLCs will meet to discuss effective instructional strategies and plan for scaffolded supports. The Leadership Team and/or administration will plan on-site opportunities for professional development based on observed trends, to include whole school trainings and/or individual coaching cycles.

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

Instructional staff will continue to be supported by the content area Leadership Team in planning for and presenting the most appropriate on grade level instruction. Teachers will be provided with professional development on-site to support needs identified during classroom walkthroughs and based on student data. Targeted small groups will be planned for and implemented to support individual student needs.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

The area of focus for the 22-23 school year is to continue cultivating a culture for teaching and learning. School data indicates an increase in overall gains and gains of students in the bottom quartile for both ELA and Mathematics. A continued focus on instructional culture, specifically related to student engagement and assessment, will lead to an increase in achievement for all learners.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Proficiency for both reading and mathematics will increase to at least 50 of all students scoring Levels 3-5, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

**Monitoring:**

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

Results from ongoing progress monitoring assessments will show gradual improvement as tiered instruction is provided at the core. Frequent classroom walk throughs, and observations made during the school year as part of the formal evaluation process, will show increased differentiation and opportunities for student ownership and engagement.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

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

Teachers will leverage data to provided scaffolding strategies and ongoing feedback to accelerate learning of on grade level content.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

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

A continued emphasis on instructional planning and preparation, including success criteria based on the standards (to include additional professional development opportunities during the 22-23 school year) will ensure that students are presented with the most appropriate instruction to meet their individual needs.

**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 training opportunities for teachers to build knowledge of standards, increasing alignment and rigor, and learning acceleration. Trainings may be provided by coaches and/or district personnel, and may include professional literature or on/off site opportunities with substitute coverage. Trainings may include but are not limited to: Learning Acceleration versus Remediation, Informational and/or Literature Standards (ELA), and Assessment for Learning.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

Establish systems for accountability through ongoing progress monitoring. OPM will be used regularly before, during, and after instruction, with immediate adjustments to instruction being made based on



student feedback. Students will be fully aware of the criteria used to evaluate their work, and their progress toward mastery. Teachers will conduct frequent data chats following district and classroom formative assessments, and will set and revisit goals with individual students. Students will engage in self-assessment as part of this reflection.

**Person Responsible**      Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

The school will focus on increasing reading and mathematics achievement for students in the Black subgroup. Students within this subgroup demonstrating a need for support based on historic and/or current data, will be provided targeted small group instruction daily.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At least 50% of all students within the Black subgroup will demonstrate proficiency on the 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), compared to 25% on the 2022 FSA.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student data will be monitored using ongoing formative assessment, and instruction will be modified in response to student progress to ensure continued growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

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

Small group instruction will be provided by the homeroom teacher or reading/math resource teacher. Students will be provided additional intervention during the Extended Learning Program (ELP), as well, using district-provided, research-based resources.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Continued emphasis on response to individual student data in designing just in time supports will result in increased achievement. Teachers will be supported by academic coaches in analyzing student data, creating groups based on this analysis, and planning for/implementing small group instruction using observed trends/patterns of student needs.

**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.

Establish systems for accountability through ongoing progress monitoring. OPM will be used regularly before, during, and after instruction, with immediate adjustments to instruction being made based on student feedback. Students will be fully aware of the criteria used to evaluate their work, and their progress toward mastery. Teachers will conduct frequent data chats following district and classroom formative assessments, and will set and revisit goals with individual students. Students will engage in self-assessment as part of this reflection.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

**#3. 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.**

The school will focus on increasing reading and mathematics achievement for students in the SWD subgroup. Students within this subgroup demonstrating a need for support based on historic and/or current data, will be provided targeted small group instruction daily.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At least 50% of all students within the SWD subgroup will demonstrate proficiency on the 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), compared to 38% on the 2022 FSA.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student data will be monitored using ongoing formative assessment, and instruction will be modified in response to student progress to ensure continued growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

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

Student data will be monitored using ongoing formative assessment, and instruction will be modified in response to student progress to ensure continued growth.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Continued emphasis on response to individual student data in designing just in time supports will result in increased achievement. Teachers will be supported by academic coaches in analyzing student data, creating groups based on this analysis, and planning for/implementing small group instruction using observed trends/patterns of student needs.

**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.

Establish systems for accountability through ongoing progress monitoring. OPM will be used regularly before, during, and after instruction, with immediate adjustments to instruction being made based on student feedback. Students will be fully aware of the criteria used to evaluate their work, and their progress toward mastery. Teachers will conduct frequent data chats following district and classroom formative assessments, and will set and revisit goals with individual students. Students will engage in self-assessment as part of this reflection.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

## 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

Implement a data analysis protocol to ensure opportunities for teachers and student ownership of the data. In addition, the data analysis protocol will ensure teachers make instructional decisions in planning based on both formal and informal data. Based on the 2022 ELA FSA scores, 45% of students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency.

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

Implement a data analysis protocol to ensure opportunities for teachers and student ownership of the data. In addition, the data analysis protocol will ensure teachers make instructional decisions in planning based on both formal and informal data. Based on the 2022 ELA FSA scores, 45% of students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency.

### 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)

The percent of students in grade K-2 scoring at or above proficiency will be at least 50% as measured during the spring progress monitoring window.

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

The percent of 3-5 grade students scoring a Level 3 or above on the ELA FAST will increase to 50% when administered in Spring 2023.

#### **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.

Results from ongoing progress monitoring assessments will show gradual improvement. Frequent classroom walk throughs, and observations made during the school year as part of the formal evaluation process, will show increased differentiation and opportunities for student ownership and engagement, utilizing data-based instructional decisions.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Kepa, Jessica, [jessica.kepa@hcps.net](mailto:jessica.kepa@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?

By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include conducting student data chats with kindergarten through fifth grade students--including a review previous year's FSA data, i-Ready (as applicable), performance tasks, and culminating experience, and pre-requisite data to increase student ownership and teacher awareness of needs. Data chats will continue following each formative assessment administered.

#### **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?

In 2022 the data showed a decrease of 2 percentage points in ELA from the 2021 ELA FSA. The improvement strategy of increased implementation of data protocols to create ownership and awareness will result in improved student academic performance in ELA.

**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
Identify the bottom quartile students in third through fifth grade and develop a plan to track the identified student's progress in teacher data chats, as well as student data chats. Regularly share data with the school-based leadership team. Adjust support plans based on on-going data collection. Monitor student's progress through walkthroughs and analysis of student work.	Kepa, Jessica, jessica.kepa@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.**

We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home flyers, making Parent Link phone calls and/or text message alerts, and posting everything on our website and social media platforms. We focus on communicating every child's progress to their families by engaging parents in parent/teacher conferences quarterly and as needed, and sending home quarterly progress reports. School staff, students, parents, and the school community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. We persist at building positive relationships with families and the school community as a whole. Opportunities for participation include, but are not limited to: Meet the Teacher/Open House, SAC, PTA, Newsletters, Website, Canvas, school marquee, Parent Link, quarterly Conference Nights, Volunteer Orientation and Recognition, Academic Family Nights (ELA/STEAM), Committee Events, Great American Teach-In, and Community Partnerships.

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

Administration and the Leadership Team plan opportunities for parents to engage with the school community. Student Services support individual students demonstrating a need for targeted support. Teachers promote a positive environment by participating in Mindset Monday with their students, a time set aside to deliver lessons provided to our school as part of its participation as a Foundational 7 Mindsets School this year.