Temple Terrace Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Temple Terrace Elementary School

124 FLOTTO AVE, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ashley Cochol

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2022

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: D (39%) 2017-18: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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

Temple Terrace Elementary School

124 FLOTTO AVE, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

[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	85%

School Grades History

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

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.

Teaching Individuals to Grow where Everyone Reaches Success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To develop a positive learning community where everyone succeeds.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cochol, Ashley	Principal	
Schaffer, Alice	Assistant Principal	
Falcone, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	MTSS Academic and Behavior Organize and facilitate Grade Level tier 3 meetings Provide coaching and support around the MTSS process Provide coaching and support with Behavior
Latta, Colleen	ELL Compliance Specialist	Coach teachers on ELL strategies Facilitate Team meetings for ELL support manage ELLpara
Haley, Courtney	Instructional Coach	ELA Coach Provide PD Facilitate planning sessions Facilitate data sessions Model instructional strategies Plan and implement reading interventions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/13/2022, Ashley Cochol

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

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

457

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.

8

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	66	73	76	76	73	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	427
Attendance below 90 percent	0	27	24	17	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	6	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	11	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	5	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	5	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	86	82	81	92	119	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	36	35	24	28	32	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	2	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	48	89	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190

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	2	2	3	1	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	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	86	82	81	92	119	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	36	35	24	28	32	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	2	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	48	89	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190

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	2	2	3	1	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	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	31%	53%	56%				36%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						46%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						35%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	35%	50%	50%				38%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						49%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						32%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	59%	59%				38%	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	32%	52%	-20%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

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	30%	54%	-24%	62%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	34%	57%	-23%	64%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	36%	51%	-15%	53%	-17%
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	8	56	53	10	37	50					
ELL	18	47	42	29	48		7				
BLK	32	61	55	33	67	62	34				
HSP	25	54		33	48		21				
MUL	50			70							
WHT	30	59		32	50						
FRL	29	61	57	34	61	61	27				

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	3	18		3							
ELL	31	64		27	62						
BLK	26	40	50	24	25	25	10				
HSP	35	57		28	50		28				
MUL	33			47							
WHT	38			35							
FRL	30	47	50	27	33	38	21				

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	8	15	24	11	23	14					
ELL	25	35	27	28	50		23				
BLK	28	38	35	31	43	31	27				
HSP	48	54		44	51		50				
MUL	46			38							
WHT	46	59		54	76		69				
FRL	34	44	38	35	45	32	35				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
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	50
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	49
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?

In terms of proficiency we saw slight gains to bring ELA, Math and Science to around 30% proficiency. In terms of gains, we saw large improvement to bring our gains to about 60% of students making gains in each area. Our subgroups that are still under performing are students with disabilities, Hispanic students and ELL students.

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

While our gains showed the largest growth from the prior year to now, to meet our goals, we need at least 80% of students making adequate progress. Our ESSA subgroups show that our students in need (SWD, ELL and Hispanic) are not making as much progress as the other groups. Finally, while they increased from previous years, our proficiency numbers are also low. To reach our goals, we would need proficiency to average at least 45%.

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

During the prior school year, the admin and resource team pulled small groups of identified students to achieve the goal of a C. While this was effective in grabbing enough points to hit the C, it is not sustainable. To create sustainable change, and reach to our goal (A), we need to strengthen core instruction and put systems and structures in place to meet the needs of all learners, inside the literacy and math blocks. We will do this by implementing purposeful planning structures utilizing backward design and data driven techniques.

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

The data component that showed the most improvements were math gains.

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

During the prior school year, the admin and resource team pulled small groups of identified students to achieve the goal of a C. While this was effective in grabbing enough points to hit the C, it is not sustainable. To create sustainable change, and reach to our goal (A), we need to strengthen core instruction and put systems and structures in place to meet the needs of all learners, inside the literacy and math blocks. We will do this by implementing purposeful planning structures utilizing backward design and data driven techniques.

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

Professional development and coaching to improve teacher practice. Planning and data analysis to improve instruction. Data action planning to inform and improve small group instruction.

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.

In September we will begin Content PLC in each grade level and content area. These sessions will be designed and facilitated by coaches. They will focus on increasing teacher content knowledge of new grade level benchmarks and best practices that impact instruction. These sessions will also unpack upcoming units so that teachers are able to design lessons to meet need. Each grade level will also meet weekly with coaches to design instruction and plan for use of best practices.
Admin will conduct weekly walkthroughs to collect trend data to identify the areas of need for professional development topics for Tuesday PD sessions. Potential PD topics include: teacher clarity, classroom discussion, small group structures and techniques.
Admin will conduct observations and feedback cycles with teachers to coach and grow them throughout the school year.

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

The structures and supports described above will allow admin and coaches to work together to grow teachers by developing content knowledge and improving teacher practice. The planning and PD structures will remain in place, as we will continue to grow our teachers and always push to improve. This systemic change will allow us to make lasting improvements to the school that last more than just one testing year.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Teachers will design and implement high quality instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards and differentiated to meet student needs.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	On the May 2023 administration of the FAST, 45% of students will be proficient in ELA, Math and Science. In addition, on the May 2023 administration of FAST, 80% of students will demonstrate learning gains in ELA and Math. This will result in an increase from a school grade of "C" to a school grade of "A." By December 2022, at least 65% of all K- 5 teachers and by May 2023, at least 85% of teachers will implement high quality, differentiated, BEST standards-aligned lessons, developed during the weekly collaborative planning sessions, as measured by the school's walkthrough look-for document.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student achievement will be monitored through multiple state, district and curriculum based assessments such as FAST, iReady, Math PMT, Unit and Spotlight assessments, and StemScopes Standards Based Assessments. Data will be reviewed by instructional leadership team to monitor school progress toward goal as well as ESSA subgroup progress (SWD, H, and ELL). Instructional practices will be monitored during the weekly Academic Leadership Meeting with coaches and administrators. The team will discuss planning notes, teacher tiers data from administrative walkthroughs focused on high quality instruction and differentiated grade level content.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Cochol (ashley.cochol@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Coaches and teachers will use student achievement data (formal and informal), student work samples with on grade level standards aligned task in order to determine effective scaffolding strategies. 1. Use of data (formal and informal) to plan for and provide small group instruction in reading, math and science 2. Use of data (formal and informal) to provide scaffolded strategies during core and small group for accelerated learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**	Based on Hattie's research small group instruction has an effect size on student achievement of .47, scaffolding grade level content has an effect size of .82, and acceleration strategies has an effect size of .68. These strategies will support the development of high-quality, small group instruction and deepen teachers' understanding of grade level content and standards. This will ensure students receive instruction aligned to the expectations of grade level standards while scaffolded to meet the individual needs.

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.

Administrators and coaches will meet weekly to review walkthrough data, plan for teacher planning sessions and coaching cycles, and determine next steps for professional development opportunities. During this meeting, all parties will discuss and monitor the progress of the ESSA subgroups (SWD, H, and ELL).

Person Responsible   Ashley Cochol (ashley.cochol@hcps.net)

Targeted classroom walkthroughs by administration and coaches will be conducted weekly during small group instruction to provide in-the-moment coaching and actionable feedback to improve instructional practice.

Person Responsible   Ashley Cochol (ashley.cochol@hcps.net)

Coaches will facilitate weekly grade level PLCs to build teacher knowledge of grade level content and expectations in reading, math and science. Teachers will learn strategies to scaffold grade level content during small group instruction so students in all the ESSA subgroups (SWD, H, and ELL) receive appropriate strategies and supports, including accommodations and modifications where appropriate, to engage with rigorous work. Grade level PLCs will be scheduled outside of the normal working day, requiring funding from Federal Programs to pay teachers.

Person Responsible   Ashley Cochol (ashley.cochol@hcps.net)

Coaches will facilitate weekly grade level planning sessions after school (additional planning time) to plan for small group instruction for ESSA subgroups (SWD, H, and ELL) in reading, math and science. This additional planning time will allow coaches and teachers to plan lessons that align with the standards for the grade or addressing specific skill deficiencies that hold them back from doing grade-level work. Small group lessons will include questions and tasks that provide opportunities for students to respond to and build on one another's thinking throughout the lesson to deepen their understanding of the content. The questions, tasks, or assessments planned during this planning time will yield data that allow the teacher to assess students' progress toward learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards and provides for further lesson adjustments.

Person Responsible   Alice Schaffer (alice.schaffer@hcps.net)

Coaches will conduct frequent coaching cycles with teachers to improve quality and effectiveness of instruction in small group, scaffolding strategies and acceleration of grade level content. The frequency and focus of coaching cycles will be based on tiering of teachers and walkthrough data. These coaching plans will be developed during weekly academic leadership meetings mentioned in previous action step.

Person Responsible   Courtney Haley (courtney.haley@hcps.net)

Administrators and coaches will provide teachers with job-embedded professional development opportunities to improve the quality of small group instruction, scaffolding strategies and acceleration of grade level content. Opportunities include Tuesday trainings, learning walks, and additional training on Saturday. Topics for professional development include but are not limited to: higher order questioning and discussion practices, scaffolding strategies, and making learning visible, as well as other district provided

professional development. Following PD sessions, teachers will work with coaches for safe practice and will provide coaching on implementation. Administrators and coaches will then conduct walkthroughs to determine next steps.

Person Responsible	Ashley Cochol (ashley.cochol@hcps.net)

Administrators and coaches will facilitate monthly Data Dives with the data from district monthly assessments. During these Data Dives administrators, coaches and teachers will collaborate to analyze student work, determine misconceptions and plan for adjustments to small group instruction. Attention will be focused on the progress of students in the ESSA subgroups (SWD, H, and ELL)

Person Responsible	Ashley Cochol (ashley.cochol@hcps.net)

Administrators, coaches and teachers will individually set goals with students. This will increase student ownership of data and engagement in the instruction.

Person Responsible	Alice Schaffer (alice.schaffer@hcps.net)

Teachers will use manipulatives to provide hands-on practice with grade level content during small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Alice Schaffer (alice.schaffer@hcps.net)

Teachers will provide students with classroom libraries to choose independent reading books from. This will allow students to independently practice reading skills learned during small group instruction. Teachers will work to ensure that our diverse student population is represented in books, including our ESSA subgroups (SWD, H, ELL).

Person Responsible	Courtney Haley (courtney.haley@hcps.net)

Teachers will use manipulatives to provide hands-on practice with grade level content during small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Alice Schaffer (alice.schaffer@hcps.net)

Teachers will provide students with classroom libraries to choose independent reading books from. This will allow students to independently practice reading skills learned during small group instruction. Teachers will work to ensure that our diverse student population is represented in books, including our ESSA subgroups (SWD, H, ELL).

Person Responsible	Courtney Haley (courtney.haley@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

Area of Focus: Teachers will design and implement high-quality instruction in a differentiated small group setting focused on foundational skills.
Rationale: In 2022 only 31% of students were proficient in Reading. Furthermore, In 2022, only 59% of students made gains in Reading. It is evident that small group instruction is needed to provide access to grade level appropriate foundational skills.

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

Area of Focus: Teachers will design and implement high-quality instruction in a differentiated small group setting focused on grade level content.
Rationale: In 2022 only 31% of students were proficient in Reading. Furthermore, In 2022, only 59% of students made gains in Reading. It is evident that small group instruction is needed to provide access to grade level content.

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)

In May of 2023, 45% of students will be proficient or "on grade level" on the new standardized state assessment (STAR). In May of 2024, 50% of students will be proficient.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In May of 2023, 45% of students will be proficient or Level 3 or higher on the new standardized state assessment (FAST). In May of 2024, 50% of students will be proficient.

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.

Progress toward the outcome will be monitored in September and December on the STAR and FAST assessments. We will also monitor progress toward the goal on informal assessment provided through the Wonders Curriculum. Results from these assessments will be reviewed by the academic leadership team, throughout the school year, and adjustments to the plan will be made accordingly.

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

Haley, Courtney, courtney.haley@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?

Small Group Instruction of standards aligned grade level content

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?

Based on Hattie's research small group instruction has an effect size on student achievement of .47, scaffolding grade level content has an effect size of .82, and acceleration strategies has an effect size of .68. These strategies will support the development of high-quality, small group instruction and deepen teachers' understanding of grade level content and standards. This will ensure students receive instruction aligned to the expectations of grade level standards while scaffolded to meet the individual needs.

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
Targeted classroom walkthroughs by administration and coaches will be conducted weekly during small group instruction to provide in-the-moment coaching and actionable feedback to improve instructional practice.	Haley, Courtney, courtney.haley@hcps.net
Administrators and coaches will meet weekly to review walkthrough data, plan for teacher planning sessions and coaching cycles, and determine next steps for professional development opportunities.	Haley, Courtney, courtney.haley@hcps.net
Coaches will facilitate weekly grade level PLCs to build teacher knowledge of grade level content and expectations in ELA. Teachers will learn strategies to scaffold grade level content during small group instruction, so students receive appropriate strategies and supports, including accommodations and modifications where appropriate, to engage with rigorous work. Grade level PLCs will be scheduled in the master schedule to provide teachers with an hour of PLC time during the day.	Haley, Courtney, courtney.haley@hcps.net
Coaches will facilitate weekly grade level planning sessions after school (additional planning time) to plan for small group instruction in ELA. This additional planning time will allow coaches and teachers to plan lessons that align with the standards for the grade or addressing specific skill deficiencies that hold them back from doing grade-level work. Small group lessons will include questions and tasks that provide opportunities for students to respond to and build on one another's thinking throughout the lesson to deepen their understanding of the content. The questions, tasks, or assessments planned during this planning time will yield data that allow the teacher to assess students' progress toward learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards and provides for further lesson adjustments. The lesson plans will also include opportunity for teachers to deliberately check for understanding throughout the lesson and adapt the lesson according to student understanding.	Haley, Courtney, courtney.haley@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.

During preplanning, RTI-B Resource teacher and administrators will provide teachers with professional development on using restorative practices and community circles during morning meeting. Community circles will all follow a consistent structure of: Opening/Check-In, Agreements, Talking Piece, Discussion Rounds, Check Out, Closing. Teachers will hold daily Community Circles with class to establish safe and respectful environment. During this time teachers will be able to proactively address behaviors, anxieties and stressors that students bring with them to school. The Social Services Team will oversee the grade level SEL lessons and assist the teachers as needed. They will be assigned as follows: K-1: Social Worker; 2-3: Psychologist;4-5: RtI Interventionist. The Guidance Counselor will oversee and assist all grade levels/ Social Services Team to ensure that SEL lessons are effective.

Teachers will positively reinforce individual student behavior by rewarding students with Kickboard dollars. Students will earn Kickboard dollars to spend weekly, monthly and quarterly.

Weekly: Students can purchase items from the teacher.

Monthly: Students can purchase items/activities from RtI Interventionist.

Quarterly: Students can purchase entry to the Scholar Dollar Event.

Administration / Social Services Team will assign students with time in the Tiger Cave. Students should be assigned work from the classroom teacher to complete during their stay in the Tiger Cave. In addition to their classwork, the Assistant Teacher will work with students on SEL components. While in the Tiger Cave, the student will participate in a schedule that will include time to reflect and /or complete a reflection piece; they will have academic time to complete reading/math and at some point in the day they will meet with their assigned Student Service Member to plan for how to re-enter the classroom successfully.

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

Principal/Assistant Principal- set and communicate the vision, work with team to create the plan, hold teachers, staff and students to high expectation, celebrate the wins, demonstrate willingness to do work with the teachers, give feedback to continue growth.

Leadership team- assist in creation of the plan, support teachers, troubleshoot problems with teachers, provide coaching and mentoring.

Student Services Staff- provide parents with connections to needed support, advocate for families needs, educate teachers and staff on needs of families and strategies for working with this diverse and

impoverished population, communicate needs with admin/leadership, participate in the plan, communicate clearly and respectfully with students and families, be willing to receive feedback and continue to grow.

Teachers/Staff- communicate needs with admin/leadership, participate in the plan, communicate clearly and respectfully with students and families, be willing to receive feedback and continue to grow.