

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Muller Elementary Magnet 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

Muller Elementary Magnet School

13615 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33613

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melanie Bottini

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 (51%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Muller Elementary Magnet School

13615 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33613

[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 KG-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	91%

School Grades History

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

Muller Elementary Magnet School, staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Muller Elementary Magnet School will prepare students for life through the arts, science, and leadership.

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
Bottini, Melanie	Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional Leadership 2. Safety and Security of all Stakeholders 3. Building Management 4. Culture Building
Pryor, Michelle	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional Leadership 2. Safety and Security of all Stakeholders 3. Building Management 4. Culture Building
Mansfield, Lyndee	School Counselor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Culture Building 2. SEL Lessons with Students
Freiner, Kallie	Math Coach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Math Instruction 2. Math Planning with Teachers 3. Math Coaching Instruction 4. Math Data Analysis 5. Math Professional Development
Leach, Faye	Reading Coach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading Instruction 2. Reading Planning with Teachers 3. Reading Coaching Instruction 4. Reading Data Analysis 5. Reading Professional Development

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Melanie Bottini

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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

435

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

9

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	68	67	68	75	70	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	416
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	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	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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	63	67	72	75	65	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	63	67	72	75	65	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	49%	53%	56%				64%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						63%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						64%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	56%	50%	50%				61%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						74%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						55%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	59%	59%				61%	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	68%	52%	16%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	53%	8%
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	42	50	37	42	12	37				
ELL	39	39	33	46	36		41				
BLK	49	50		59	68		63				
HSP	51	58	42	53	47	24	44				
MUL	38			46							
WHT	44	67		59	58						
FRL	44	52	50	49	53	36	39				
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	11	31		28	38		8				
ELL	28			50							
BLK	45	46	30	48	54		43				
HSP	39	43		51	70		35				
MUL				70							
WHT	60			60							
FRL	38	47	31	48	62	43	42				
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	47	55		42	68	55					
ELL	35	52	58	55	73	54	47				
BLK	67	59	69	51	68	53	40				
HSP	53	61	62	63	73	57	67				
WHT	80	80		72	87						
FRL	59	63	65	57	71	57	57				

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	52
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	415
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	42
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	58
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	48
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	42
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	
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	48
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?

A trend that emerged across most grade levels is a increase in proficiency for Reading, Math, and Science (for 5th grade.)

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

Although there has been an increase in proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science, a greater number of students need to increase to the targeted proficiency level.

Based on 2021-2022 state scores:

- Reading Proficiency is 49% +6
- Math Proficiency is 56% +4
- Science Proficiency is 49% +4
- Reading BQ Gains 50%
- Math BQ Gains 40%

355/700 points=C

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

Based on 2021 state assessments:

Students need to make substantial progress in order to be proficient in ELA. Science proficiency closely correlate to reading deficits and science proficiency still needs to increase.

Action Plans include: Schoolwide monthly tracking of progress monitoring assessments. Monthly monitoring of Science proficiency with an increased emphasis on the Scientific Process.

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

Math data has the highest level of proficiency and Reading has the highest gain in proficiency percentage.

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

A Reading coach and a Math coach contributed to this growth by providing support in teaching, working in small groups, continuously analyzed data with instructors, and supported planning for Reading and Math instruction.

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

Teachers intervening at just the right time, using grade level lessons and beyond with scaffolding support, and connecting unfinished learning into the context of new learning. In addition, a focus on academic ownership will be implemented.

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.

Continuous classroom walkthroughs using the Instructional Priorities Checklists will steer professional development. Professional development will include: How to Accelerate Learning, Using Rubrics, Four Principles of Excellent Teaching, Keys to Small Group Instruction, and Building Academic Ownership..

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

The Leadership Team will monitor monthly progress in Reading, Math, and Science. The Reading Resource Teacher, Math Resource Teacher, and Science Lead Teacher will continue to support instructional planning and PLC's each week with the focus on Academic Ownership..

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

The need to increase student proficiency levels is a critical need based on 2021-2022 Reading, Math, and Science FSA data. Instruction will align with the new 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.

Our Instructional Priorities are: Student achievement will increase through academic ownership where teachers and students build a classroom environment in which:
 *students are doing most of the thinking
 *students understand their data in order to make academic decisions
 *teachers build a deep understanding of student data in order to make instructional decisions

To ensure that this is taking place, walkthroughs will be conducted by the Principal and Assistant Principal.
 Specific walkthrough look-fors include: what the teacher is doing, what students are doing and how decisions are being made by the students and teacher based on data.

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

We will increase Reading proficiency by 11 points in December 2023.
 We will increase Math proficiency by 4 points in December 2023.
 We will increase Science proficiency by 11 points in December 2023.

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

Our Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Checklist and the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction will be used to give actionable walkthrough feedback to each instructional staff member. Immediately following a walkthrough, written feedback is given directly to the teacher in the classroom by the principal or sent electronically by the assistant principal.

The Leadership Team will analyze the observation trends and determine the next steps. The Leadership Team, which includes both the school Reading Resource and the Math Resource teachers will coach and support planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

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

Evidence of increased teacher effectiveness through improved targeted feedback (.75 is feedback effect size) to teachers from walkthroughs using the Instructional Priorities Academic Ownership Checklist (1.57 is teacher efficacy effect size)

Increase in students' academic ownership (1.33 is self reported grades effect size and self-efficacy is .92)

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

The improvement strategy of feedback to teachers will result in improved academic ownership of teaching and student academic ownership for performance.

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.

- 2022 FSA Data is analyzed and reviewed by administration.
- Principal writes 3 Instructional Priorities
- The Instructional Priorities is edited and approved by the Leadership Team.
- Teachers create the Walkthrough Look-Fors
- Assistant Principal shares walkthrough trends with the staff.
- Principal shares Instructional Priorities Checklist with instructional staff.
- Walkthroughs with immediate feedback are conducted consistently.

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@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

Our Instructional Priorities are: Student achievement will increase through consistent instructional coaching in ELA.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA scores, where 62% in 3rd grade, 48% in 4th grade, and 34% in 5th grade scored a level 3 proficiency or higher, 52% of the 4th graders (now in 5th grade) are not on track to score a Level 3 or above

The need to increase student proficiency levels is a critical need based on 2021-2022 Reading, Math, and Science FSA data. Instruction will align with the new B.E.S.T standards.

Our Instructional Priorities are: Student achievement will increase through consistent instructional coaching in ELA.

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)

Using the B.E.S.T. Standards, FAST Assessment results, instructional coaching and continuous progress monitoring, we will increase Reading proficiency by 11 points in December 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Using the B.E.S.T. Standards, FAST Assessment results, instructional coaching and continuous progress monitoring, we will increase Reading proficiency by 11 points in December 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.

Our Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Checklist and the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction will be used to give actionable walkthrough feedback to each instructional staff member. Immediately following a walkthrough, written feedback is given directly to the teacher in the classroom by the principal or sent electronically by the assistant principal.

The Leadership Team will analyze the observation trends and determine the next steps. The Leadership Team, which includes the school Reading Resource Teacher will coach and support planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Leach, Faye, faye.leach@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?

Identified evidence based practice of increased teacher effectiveness through improved targeted feedback from the instructional coach to teachers (.75 is feedback effect size) and opportunities to evaluate deliberate practice (.79 evaluate practice effect size) and reflect. (.75 reflection effect size). These practices are aligned with the K-12 Comprehensive evidence based Reading Plan and B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

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?

Targeted feedback and instructional coaching will be used to increase teacher effectiveness.

In order to increase student achievement, evidence of increased teacher effectiveness through improved targeted feedback from the instructional coach to teachers has a .75 effect size, opportunities to evaluate deliberate practice has a .79 effect size, and reflection has a .75 Hattie's effect size.

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
Literacy Leadership-Reading Coach attends weekly meetings with administration on on the Leadership Team, shares reading needs, data, progress, leads training, leads reading PLCs, and leads reading planning with teachers.	Bottini, Melanie, melanie.bottini@hcps.net
Literacy Coaching- Reading Coach will model teaching lessons and conduct side by side coaching individually and provide professional learning opportunities with grade level teams.	Bottini, Melanie, melanie.bottini@hcps.net
Reading Assessment Data Analysis- The Reading Coach will review and analyze all reading data and work with the Leadership Team and teachers to determine and implement next steps.	Bottini, Melanie, melanie.bottini@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.

Muller Elementary Magnet School fosters a supportive and positive environment in which relationships between one another thrive with respect, high expectations, staff and student leadership, positivity, and trust.

Muller Elementary Magnet School is a Leader In Me School which focuses on Covey's 7 Habits of Highly Effective People (and Kids). Key concepts of Leadership, Academics, and Culture are learned and practiced by staff and students. On the last day of school, in the unique year of 2020, Muller Elementary Magnet School was awarded the prestigious Leader in Me Lighthouse School Award!

This award was based on Student Leadership, School Culture, Environment for Learning, and Academics. Staff professional development upon being hired starts with teachers learning and living the 7 Habits in order to strengthen the professional culture. Students are taught and practice the 7 Habits which incorporates a positive school culture by goal setting, problem solving, knowing oneself, and positive peer interactions.

Each year, all stakeholders participate in a yearly Leader in Me Survey to progress monitor the key components of Leader In Me. The data from this yearly survey and from the new 2022 Insight Survey help us build a better culture each year.

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

Principal-reviews survey results with staff, celebrates top areas and creates an action plan collaboratively with the staff for areas of concern. Communicates the plan and models positivity and a growth mindset.

Assistant Principal- Assists with data analysis, survey distribution, planning, and Power Point presentations to communicate plans for a positive and informative learning environment. Communicates the plan and models a growth mindset.

Guidance Counselor-Guidance lessons for student support a positive culture and Habit Heroes celebrations

Staff- Collaborates after analyzing school culture data to contribute ideas for a plan based on survey results.

Parents-participates in surveys, give feedback, helps analyze data through PTA and the School Advisory Council.

Students-Learns the 7 Habits, practices the 7 Habits, holds leadership roles, plans schoolwide events, leads schoolwide events as emcees, directors, tour guides, etc. gives feedback, and celebrates habit success through our Habits Heroes Celebrations