

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Turner Bartels K 8 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>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Turner Bartels K 8 School

9190 IMPERIAL OAK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: R. Lamarr Buggs, Jr

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
<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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%)
<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>	ATSI
* 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>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Turner Bartels K 8 School

9190 IMPERIAL OAK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[ 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)
Combination School KG-8	No	47%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Student achievement will be fostered by using data informed standard-based instructions, research-based interventions, and unconditional positive regard to all students.

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

Building genuine relationships to ensure the success of all stakeholders.

### 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
Buggs, Robert	Principal	
Enis, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	
Quinta, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	
Perez-Reinaldo, Michelle	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, R. Lamarr Buggs, Jr

**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.*

33

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

112

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

1,500

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

19

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

23

## 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	142	152	145	186	168	197	214	226	244	0	0	0	0	1674
Attendance below 90 percent	29	14	17	20	15	38	37	39	34	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	21	17	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	24	26	55	70	72	0	0	0	0	282
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	38	32	23	65	74	65	0	0	0	0	297
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	0	3	6	1	7	12	24	0	0	0	53

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		1	2	1	19	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/2/2022

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	124	139	136	168	155	184	188	196	216	0	0	0	0	1506
Attendance below 90 percent	26	16	10	19	18	21	38	47	57	0	0	0	0	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	3	17	13	18	0	0	0	0	55
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	21	12	17	38	40	42	0	0	0	0	170
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	25	22	31	33	34	0	0	0	0	170
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	0	1	2	2	11	16	12	0	0	0	44

**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	0	5	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times		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	124	139	136	168	155	184	188	196	216	0	0	0	0	1506
Attendance below 90 percent	26	16	10	19	18	21	38	47	57	0	0	0	0	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	3	17	13	18	0	0	0	0	55
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	21	12	17	38	40	42	0	0	0	0	170
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	25	22	31	33	34	0	0	0	0	170
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	0	1	2	2	11	16	12	0	0	0	0	44

**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	0	5	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	15
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	58%	51%	55%				63%	57%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						59%	56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						46%	52%	54%
Math Achievement	56%	41%	42%				62%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	64%						62%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						44%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	51%	48%	54%				59%	50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	57%	59%				68%	77%	78%

### 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	70%	52%	18%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
06	2022					
	2019	50%	53%	-3%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
07	2022					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2022					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2022					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
07	2022					
	2019	61%	62%	-1%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2022					
	2019	22%	31%	-9%	46%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	70%	51%	19%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	48%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	63%	67%	-4%	71%	-8%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	91%	63%	28%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

### 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	25	42	36	28	51	59	17	24			
ELL	32	37	24	32	52	51	21	48			
ASN	89	84		90	89	82	83		100		
BLK	45	45	35	37	55	63	39	58	63		
HSP	44	45	27	43	57	54	39	49	83		
MUL	68	61		66	74		64				
WHT	64	62	50	64	65	63	48	81	84		
FRL	43	45	32	39	59	66	33	53	75		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	34	37	18	33	26	24	29			
ELL	31	36	35	30	36	29	20	31	57		
ASN	84	72		78	50	18	70	90	88		
BLK	41	42	31	30	27	28	39	56	42		
HSP	45	38	29	34	35	32	38	45	48		
MUL	64	63		60	40		56	91			
WHT	63	54	52	56	49	37	62	68	64		
FRL	39	39	34	29	30	29	31	46	40		
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	26	43	39	21	43	43	18	29			
ELL	31	56	53	40	56	43	36	27			
ASN	84	77	69	90	83		84	88	96		
BLK	51	51	48	45	51	40	38	66	75		
HSP	52	53	39	51	59	44	49	58	91		
MUL	69	59		71	79		79	92	100		
WHT	68	63	47	68	61	42	69	70	94		
FRL	46	52	42	45	54	44	43	57	85		

### 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	58
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	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	580

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	38
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	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
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?

- \*Each grade level improved in Math on the state-wide FSA test.
- \*Each grade level improved in ELA except for grades Three (3rd) and Eight (8th).
- \*Civics EOC scores improved significantly from 38% proficiency to 67%.
- \*Both 5th and 8th grade Science scores dropped for the third consecutive year.
- \*7th grade Math scores continue to lag behind regional counterparts.
- \*Although improved, less than 43% of middle schoolers made proficiency in Math.
- \*Less than 40% of all 4th-8th Bottom Quartile ELA students made gains on the state-wide FSA test.
- \*Student Industry Certification lags behind comparable certification opportunities.

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

- \*5th and 8th grade Science.
- \*Middle school Math proficiency.
- \*Bottom Quartile ELA students.

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

A deep dive into standards that greatly challenge our students in Science and middle school ELA and Math is needed. Improve team instructional standard-based planning. Enhance classroom instructional delivery. Consistent progress monitoring.

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

- \*Each grade level improved in Math on the state-wide FSA test.
- \*Each grade level improved in ELA except for grades Three (3rd) and Eight (8th).
- \*Civics EOC scores improved significantly from 38% proficiency to 67%.

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

More students having face-to-face instruction with highly qualified teachers than the previous dual brick and mortar and virtual schedule.

Civics: Strategic scheduling, increased rigorous learning activities, and instructional "boot-camps" helped increase Civic EOC scores.

Middle School Math instructors received district support in PLC's and standard-based planning.

Increased professional development opportunities campus-wide to enhance classroom instruction.

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

Continued team collaborative PLC's and planning to increase content knowledge, share instructional strategies to enhance students' learning experiences.

Deliver standard-based instruction that challenges students' thinking that focuses on what students need and not what they already know.

Assess and progress monitor students regularly with effective feedback. Provide evidence of student learning and needs through data collection, lesson wrap-ups, and exit tickets. Use assessment data in planning.

**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.**

- \*Vertical K-8 planning in Math and ELA.
- \*Student Data Collection forms for Progress Monitoring and Data Chats
- \*Observation expectations and rubric discussion.
- \*PLC training
- \*Inclusion

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

No additional services.



**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 Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Low performance on standardized tests.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Overall ELA and Math scores will increase by 3% points.

**Monitoring:**

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

Through continuous progress monitoring and individualized data chats. Discussions in PLC's and ILT meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Buggs (robert.buggs@hcps.net)

Collaborative PLC's and planning to increase content knowledge, share instructional strategies to enhance students' learning experiences.

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

K-8 vertical standard-based PLC's.

Data Collection forms and notebooks that captures and improves progress monitoring.

Progress Monitoring assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Collaborative standard-based PLC's promote discussion around instructional delivery, facilitation, and enhance rigor/student activities.

Student data forms allow students take responsibility and ownership of their own progress monitoring. It allows students to communicate their growth and goals to other stakeholders. This will help teachers have conversations around progress monitoring with students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

## RAISE

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

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

In order to achieve a 3% increase in student proficiency, we will focus on utilizing more effective and consistent small group instruction in reading. Teachers will use current student data to create and plan small group lessons that are standards based and aligned to student need. Teacher Talent Developers will support grade level and school wide small group efforts through professional development, collaboration, and coaching.

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

In order to achieve a 3% increase in student proficiency, we will focus on utilizing more effective and consistent small group instruction in reading. Teachers will use current student data to create and plan small group lessons that are standards based and aligned to student need. Teacher Talent Developers will support grade level and school wide small group efforts through professional development, collaboration, and coaching.

### 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)**

There will be a 3% (or more) increase in student proficiency in reading at the end of the school year.

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

There will be a 3% (or more) increase in student proficiency in reading at the end of the school year.

**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.

Throughout the year, current assessment data for district Progress Monitoring (PM 1, 2, 3) and mini-assessment data will be reviewed by the Instructional Leadership Team and the grade level teams during their scheduled PLCs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Buggs, Robert, robert.buggs@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?

As shared in the "Visible Learning" text by Hattie, Fisher, and Frey, self-reported grades/student expectations has an effect size of 1.44 and feedback 0.75. With this in mind, school leaders, and teacher talent developers will support teachers and students in using schoolwide data folders to increase student ownership of progress monitoring. In addition, leaders will work to create professional development (effect size 0.51) to provide to staff to enhance instruction and increase student achievement.

**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?

Teachers, leaders, and staff will continue to work together to improve instruction and increase student achievement. The strategies listed above fall in the "Zone of Desired Effects." With the addition of two

Teacher Talent Developers and an Administrative Resource Teacher, we will be able to increase this focus and provide more opportunities for teacher development.

### 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
Data Folders/Assessment	
Leaders, Teacher Talent Developers, Subject Area Leaders, Team Leaders, and the Instructional Leadership Team will develop and implement data folder expectations for teachers and students. Stakeholders will use current assessment data to discuss student progress and create ownership with students.	Buggs, Robert, robert.buggs@hcps.net
Coaching/Professional Development	
Leaders, Teacher Talent Developers, Subject Area Leaders, Team Leaders, and the Instructional Leadership Team will lead, coach, and provide professional learning opportunities for teachers and staff. There will be a focus on student engagement and effective lesson planning.	Buggs, Robert, robert.buggs@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.

Turner/Bartels K-8 uses an electronic PBIS system that generates points that allows students to participate in activities during and after-school. Students are rewarded points each day in homeroom for being in uniform and arriving to school on time. They can also receive points at anytime by demonstrating Acts of Kindness and TBK8 Tiger Characteristics of being Respectful, Responsible, and Engaged.

Respectful to peers and staff

Responsible by taking care of your belongings and ownership of self and school expectations.

Engaged in academic instruction and learning activities

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

Positive school Culture and Environment is promoted and maintained by school administration, ESE Specialist and CCEIS coordinator, school counselors, school faculty and staff, PTSA, All Pro Dads, business partners, and others.