Twin Lakes Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Twin Lakes Elementary School

8507 N HABANA AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Daphne Fourqurean

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (45%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%)
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

Twin Lakes Elementary School

8507 N HABANA AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[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	94%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will provide a safe environment where students' efforts are recognized and they are encouraged to develop skills that enable them to excel in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering a community of learners and leaders.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Batista, Kilsys	Principal	Serve as the instructional leader, engage stakeholders, and collaborate with others.
Osborn, JamesL	Assistant Principal	Serve as an instructional leader, engage stakeholders, and collaborate with others.
Purcell, Stephanie	SAC Member	Serve as SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Daphne Fourqurean

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
52

Total number of students enrolled at the school
525

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
9

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	95	88	73	87	85	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	56	26	30	33	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	49	22	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	37	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
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	19	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	6	14	5	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
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 7/6/2022

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	99	86	76	80	82	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	11	3	6	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	31	37	22	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	1	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	99	86	76	80	82	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	11	3	6	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	31	37	22	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	1	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	36%	53%	56%				38%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						46%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						35%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	39%	50%	50%				37%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	53%						52%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						37%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	24%	59%	59%				39%	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	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	30%	55%	-25%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

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	25%	54%	-29%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	57%	-21%	64%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%
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	27	45	47	38	45	58	23				
ELL	35	50	50	39	52	65	27				
BLK	20	43		18	21						
HSP	38	50	61	43	57	63	29				
WHT	47			31							
FRL	35	51	55	38	54	59	22				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	28	47		20	59		25				
ELL	42	58	58	35	51		31				
BLK	35	58		31	50		33				
HSP	38	50	57	30	51	53	30				
WHT	45			36							
FRL	37	49	50	29	46	56	32				
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	13	28	32	16	42	38	10				
ELL	31	45	34	37	55	44	49				
BLK	37	38		36	46		33				
HSP	36	46	39	36	54	40	38				
WHT	48	45		37	43		33				
FRL	38	44	35	37	52	41	40				

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	48
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Comparative data from Reading iReady Diagnostic Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 shows an increase in the Vocabulary domain in grades 3-5 with 3rd grade increasing by 29%, 4th grade increasing by 13% and 5th grade increasing by 17%. There was little correlation between growth in the Vocabulary domain with students scoring on-grade level in the Comprehension Literature domain (3rd grade- 36% , 4th grade- 54%, 5th grade- 33%) and Informational domain (3rd grade- 41%, 4th grade 45%, 5th grade- 32%).

A trend emerged in the Phonics domains for students in grades 2 and 3. Students performing at grade level in the Phonics domains: 3rd grade- 53%, 2nd grade- 43%, 1st grade- 60%, Kindergarten- 71%.

iReady Diagnostic Winter 2022 for Black students in grades Kindergarten to 5th grades performing at or above grade level in the following domains: Phonics 57%, High Frequency Words 79%, Vocabulary 40%, Comprehension Literature 50%, Comprehension Informational 55%.

iReady Diagnostic Winter 2022 for Students With Disabilities in grades Kindergarten to 5th grades performing at or above grade level in the following domains: Phonics 47%, High Frequency Words 80%, Vocabulary 25%, Comprehension Literature 27%, Comprehension Information 32%.

4th grade demonstrated the greatest growth in the Math iReady Diagnostic Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 with an increase of 57% points. 3rd and 4th grade had minimal growth in the Geometry domain.

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

The Reading iReady Spring Diagnostic 2022 results show that grades K-3, and 5 had less than 50% of student proficient in Comprehension Literature domain with 4th grade at 51%. All grades K-5 demonstrated less than 50% proficiency in the Comprehension Non-Fiction domain. The data demonstrates a need for specific skills and strategies that would enhance reading comprehension among all students in K-5.

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

Contributing factors to students performing less than proficient in the Comprehension domain on the Reading iReady Diagnostic Spring 2022 is having low reading fluency specific to High Frequency Words, Phonics, and overall Vocabulary.
In order to make improvements in the areas listed, instructional personnel will use available instructional

resources that address High Frequency Words, Vocabulary, and Phonics. We will also utilize Imagine Learning's reading foundational skills resources to support the needs of English Language Learners.

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

Comparative data from Math iReady Diagnostic Spring 2022 and Fall 2021 in the Numbers and Operations domain showed that 4th grade had gains of 57% point and 3rd grade had 39% points.

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

Collaborative planning with the math content coach in 3rd and 4th grade focused on how teachers could provide "just in time" scaffolding for Numbers and Operations in daily math instruction along with a focus on the Standards of Mathematical Practice. Planning centered around areas students demonstrated proficiency and how to embed those needing additional support. The math content coach supported teachers through planning and modeling for student discourse.

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

Addressing foundational skills through systematic fluency and phonics instruction to then apply to comprehension (literature and informational.) Develop and implement student success criteria, accountability, and feedback practice to increase student ownership of work and active engagement (student clarity). Implement the resource Comprehension Toolkit K-5.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development in the use of the Developmental Reading Assessment to identify specific reading areas of student strength and weakness. Teachers will also be supported in the implementation of the Comprehension Toolkit in grades K-5. Such resource will enhance the use of skills and strategies students can apply when reading literature and non-fiction texts, increasing their comprehension. Professional development in the strategies teachers can implement during small and whole group focused on foundational skills will be provided biweekly during the first quarter of school. Additional professional development will be provided on an ongoing basis focused on the K-5 BEST Standards and Benchmarks, including reading fluency and fluency with arithmetic operations and automaticity. Teachers will also be supported in incorporating visual supports in K-5 across content areas through anchor charts, word walls, and Unit of Study Focus Walls.

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

Leadership will support teachers by providing feedback through ongoing fidelity walk-throughs. Content coaches will provide collaborative planning, build teacher capacity, and offer coaching cycles centered around the specific areas of reading and math fluency. Monitoring of student progress will be supported by a school-wide assessment calendar.

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 ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	In response to formative assessments, adapted instruction will be standards-aligned with scaffolds provided to connect and transfer skills to new learning. Student achievement in the ELA Spring FSA of 2022 showed that Less than 40% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient. Comparative data from Reading iReady Diagnostic Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 shows an increase in the Vocabulary domain in grades 3-5 with 3rd grade increasing by 29%, 4th grade increasing by 13% and 5th grade increasing by 17%. There was little correlation between growth in the Vocabulary domain with students scoring on-grade level in the Comprehension Literature domain (3rd grade- 36% , 4th grade- 54%, 5th grade- 33%) and Informational domain (3rd grade- 41%, 4th grade 45%, 5th grade- 32%). A trend emerged in the Phonics domains for students in grades 2 and 3. Students performing at grade level in the Phonics domains: 3rd grade- 53%, 2nd grade- 43%, 1st grade- 60%, Kindergarten- 71%. iReady Diagnostic Spring 2022 for Black students in grades Kindergarten to 5th grades performing at or above grade level in the following domains: Phonics 57%, High Frequency Words 79%, Vocabulary 40%, Comprehension Literature 50%, Comprehension Informational 55%. iReady Diagnostic Spring 2022 for Students With Disabilities in grades Kindergarten to 5th grades performing at or above grade level in the following domains: Phonics 47%, High Frequency Words 80%, Vocabulary 25%, Comprehension Literature 27%, Comprehension Information 32%. 40% of students identifying as White scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA Reading 2022 assessment.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	As measured by the 2023 Spring Assessment, K-5 student proficiency in Reading will increase from 47% to a minimum of 50%, a minimum of 50% of Black students, a minimum of 50% of Students with Disabilities and a minimum of 50% of White students will perform at or above grade level proficiency.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Standards based assessments will be administered for reading and math at the end of each unit of study. Administration and content area coaches will monitor teacher and student data through monthly/weekly Professional Learning Communities, data analysis, and ongoing classroom walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher clarity involves the instructional moves a teacher makes that begin with carefully planning a lesson and making the learning intentions for that lesson or unit clear to herself and her students. It extends to consistently evaluating where her students are in the learning process and in describing the success criteria and on which students can assess their own progress. It includes clarity of organization such that structured lessons in links to the objectives and outcomes of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The strategies identified to support teacher clarity were based on the research found in "Visible Learning" by: John Hattie, Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey. Teacher Clarity has an effect size of .75, "High in the Zone of Desired Effect".

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.

Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) Overview and Refresher Training and bi-weekly Reading professional development support for K-5 teachers.
August 2022 - May 2023
Teachers will be provided professional development to use the DRA to appropriately in order to identify and monitor student needs with phonics and fluency, to create a plan/system for embedding and addressing needs within the ELA framework.

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Comprehension Toolkit support for K-5 teachers provided by the reading resource teacher during collaborative planning. Resource will be used to provide students with application skills and strategies.
August 2022 - May 2023

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Teachers will be provided with examples of and support to implement Unit of Study Focus walls aligned with the Elements of the Science of Reading. Content Coaches will create a model for the teachers to refer to and access as needed.
August 2022 - May 2023

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Content area coaches to support students (Black, White, and SWD) within the classroom via bi-weekly small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Subgroups (Black, White, and SWD) monitored progress through a global tracker by Problem Solving Leadership Team monthly.

**Person
Responsible**   Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	In response to formative assessments, adapted instruction will be standards-aligned with scaffolds to connect and transfer skills to new learning. Less than 40% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient on Spring FSA 2022 Math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Based on the 2023 Spring Assessment, K-5 student proficiency in Math will increase from 39% to a minimum of 50%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Standards based assessments will be given for reading and math at the end of each unit of study. Admin and content area coaches will monitor the data through monthly/weekly PLC and data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher clarity involves the instructional moves a teacher makes that begin with carefully planning a lesson and making the learning intentions for that lesson or unit clear to herself and her students. It extends to consistently evaluating where her students are in the learning process and in describing the success criteria and on which students can assess their own progress. It includes clarity of organization such that structured lessons in links to the objectives and outcomes of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The strategies identified to support teacher clarity were based on the research found in "Visible Learning" by: John Hattie, Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey. Teacher Clarity has an effect size of .75, "High in the Zone of Desired Effect".

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.

K-5 teachers will learn about the stages of math fluency within the K-5 Number Sense Operations strand of the B.E.S.T Standards. Professional development will focus on ways to identify students' needs, appropriate instructional routines and scaffolds, and a system for monitoring progress related to procedural fluency and automaticity.
K-5 Teachers

August 2022, October 2022, January 2023, March 2023

Quarterly Vertical PLC

Parent/Family Engagement Action step--grade level specific parent academies with activities at home to support fluency/automaticity

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

K-5 teachers will receive support through coaching cycles focused on teacher actions and student observables that support the Math Thinking and Reasoning standards.

K-5 Teachers

August 2022-May 2023

At least 1 cycle per teacher

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Math coach will facilitate bi-weekly collaborative planning with K-5 teachers focused on developing success criteria, systems for monitoring student progress towards proficiency. and planning for appropriate scaffolds and visual supports.

K-5 Teachers

August 2022 - May 2023

Bi-weekly

Person Responsible	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@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

Based on the 2022 Reading iReady Spring Diagnostic, 49% of students in 1st grade and 34% of students in 2nd grade performed at, mid, or above grade level. The results are due to a misalignment of state standards, learning tasks, and success criteria during core instruction. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include standards-aligned instruction with success criteria, accountability, and feedback practices in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on the 2023 ELA state progress monitoring assessment.

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

Based on the 2022 ELA FSA Spring assessment, 20% in grade 3 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher, 48 % in grade 4 and 24 % in grade 5. The results are due to a misalignment of state standards, learning tasks, and success criteria during core instruction. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include standards-aligned instruction with success criteria, accountability, and feedback practices in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on the 2023 ELA state progress monitoring assessment.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of 1st grade students scoring at a proficient level or higher on the state progress monitoring assessment will increase to at least 50% by spring of 2023.
The percent of 2nd grade students scoring at a proficient level or higher on the state progress monitoring assessment will increase to at least 50% by spring of 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of 3rd grade students scoring at a proficient level or higher on the state progress monitoring assessment will increase to at least 50% by spring of 2023.
The percent of 4th grade students scoring at a proficient level or higher on the state progress monitoring assessment will increase to at least 50% by spring of 2023.
The percent of 5th grade students scoring at a proficient level or higher on the state progress monitoring assessment will increase to at least 50% by spring of 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.

The implementation of standards-aligned instruction with success criteria, accountability, and feedback practices with increased student ownership and active engagement will be monitored weekly during classroom walkthroughs, biweekly during grade level professional learning communities, quarterly through student progress monitoring assessment by administration, content coaches, and instructional teachers. Data gathered will be evaluated in December 2022 and May 2023 to analyze impact on teacher practice and student learning.

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

Batista, Kilsys, kilsys.batista@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?

Develop and implement student success criteria, accountability, and feedback practice in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement.

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 the 2022 Reading iReady Spring Diagnostic, 49% of students in 1st grade and 34% of students in 2nd grade performed at, mid, or above grade level.

Based on the 2022 ELA FSA Spring assessment, 20% in grade 3 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher, 48 % in grade 4 and 24 % in grade 5.

The results are due to a misalignment of state standards, learning tasks, and success criteria during core instruction. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include standards-aligned instruction with success criteria, accountability, and feedback practices in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on the 2023 ELA state progress monitoring assessment.

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
Teachers will receive professional development on reading strategies that help students connect and apply skills to new concepts.	Batista, Kilsys, kilsys.batista@hcps.net
Conduct focused walkthroughs in grades 1-5, providing feedback to teachers on use of success criteria, equitable feedback, and student engagement during reading.	Batista, Kilsys, kilsys.batista@hcps.net
Job-embedded professional development within coaching model/planning to focus on reading fluency (vocabulary, high frequency words, phonics), and the application of skills to new learning.	Batista, Kilsys, kilsys.batista@hcps.net
Collaborative planning with teachers in grades 1-5 will be supported by reading resource teachers focused on standards-aligned learning objectives, learning tasks, and success criteria.	Batista, Kilsys, kilsys.batista@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.

Twin Lakes invites parents, families, and community stakeholders to school wide events including: Meet the Teacher, STEM Family Night, Literacy Family Night, Chorus concerts, Awards quarterly assembly, Great American Teach In, Volunteer Appreciation, Conference Nights, SAC monthly meetings, ELL Semi-annual Parent meetings, Autism Acceptance Month, and other classroom events.

School-wide behavior plan utilized to set positive expectations for all areas of the school environment.

Student-Teacher-Family Compact is agreed upon at beginning of year and revisited through parent teacher conferences.

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

1. Leadership and Admin. to provide continuous support to new staff through biweekly Onboarding sessions which address individual professional development needs.
2. Academic coaching support for teachers is based on student data and teacher need related to the Teacher Rubric and monitored monthly and adjusted accordingly.
3. Monthly opportunities for feedback and celebrations for students and staff is provided by the school leadership, including academic coaches.
4. Teachers and students follow the schoolwide behavior plan which will include: core values and expectations for learner behaviors, positive reinforcement and logical consequences, individualized behavior plans for students in Tiers 2 and 3, individual and class recognition, weekly class meetings focused on promoting a positive culture for learning. Student response to the behavior plan is monitored monthly by the PSLT and the Culture Committee.
5. Instructional staff provide opportunities for students to engage in literature that is culturally appropriate through participation in the Global Read Aloud program.
6. Instructional staff provide literature that reflects our students
7. Instructional Staff encourages students to attend school daily by being present and on time. Attendance monitored by classroom teacher, data processor, school social worker and administration.