

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Wilson Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Wilson Elementary School

702 W ENGLISH ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Kayla Forcucci

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: B (59%)
<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>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Wilson Elementary School

702 W ENGLISH ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">73%</p>

## School Grades History

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

To guide each student to his or her greatest potential.

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

Preparing Students For Life

### 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
Forcucci, Kayla	Principal	
Kim, Catherine	Assistant Principal	
Jordan, Christine	Instructional Coach	
Burnside, Kristin	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2018, Kayla Forcucci

**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.*

3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/9/2022

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	50	49	55	45	47	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	10	11	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**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	1	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	50	49	55	45	47	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	10	11	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	

Students with two or more indicators      0   0   0   1   4   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   5

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year      1   5   1   1   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   8

Students retained two or more times      0   0   0   1   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   1

**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	46%	53%	56%				43%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						44%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						36%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	50%	50%				43%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	75%						41%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						33%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	59%	59%				44%	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	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	57%	-21%	64%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	44		25	69						
ELL	38	45	27	44	70	73	27				
HSP	46	56	27	52	75	71	52				
WHT	42	57		50	75		62				
FRL	43	55	33	49	72	67	46				

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	12			16							
ELL	36	42		38	40		35				
HSP	38	38	31	39	29	20	33				
WHT	37	42		39	54		62				
FRL	38	40	40	41	35	8	39				
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	32	36		44	43						
ELL	42	35	36	40	38	42	39				
BLK	40			55							
HSP	36	41	35	39	38	35	45				
WHT	52	54		44	42		55				
FRL	39	41	33	39	40	35	39				

**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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
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?

Over the course of the 21-22 school year we noticed students in primary grades were struggling to keep focus and make consistent gains. We also noticed the 3rd graders were significantly behind the performance level expected. Our 4th graders were all being taught by experienced 4th grade teachers who actively participated in planning and PLC but the student achievement for 4th grade ELA continued to be minimal. 5th grade data tended show a continual increase.

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

Reading proficiency at 46%, which is an increase, but we want this to be 50% or greater. Our BQ gains for ELA are significantly below 50%.

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

Both Reading proficiency and BQ ELA Proficiency were gains last year. We need to continue the inquiry cycles we began last year to continue to address student achievement.

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

Math across all progress monitoring cells was an increase. Math BQ was the greatest increase.

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

Our math coach worked consistently to plan and unpack standards with grade 3-5 teachers. We help multiple cycles of inquiry across the year specifically addressing the trends we saw with math instruction and student performance.

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

Identifying students for acceleration and continuing cycles of inquiry.

**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.**

Florida BEST Standard Dive for ELA, with Dee Toler, St. of Florida  
Student Ownership, with Barbara Knox, HCPS Math DRT  
Florida BEST Standard Dive for Math, with HCPS B. Knox and C. King Math Instructional Coach

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

We will conduct an instructional review in October with the assistance of district support staff. Cycles of Inquiry will be developed based on the trends seen through this review. PD and feedback will be based on the cycle.

**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:** BEST standards are being implemented across K-5 for the first time this year. The Wonders curriculum we are using to support teaching these standards is new to Grades 3-5 this year. STEM scopes is the new curriculum being used to address the BEST Math Standards. Our teachers both new and experienced are all growing their understanding of the BEST Standards and their efficiency with using the new curriculum materials.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** By Spring of 2023 students will demonstrate 49% (ELA), 52% (Math) and (60%) Science proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST PMA3.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** ELA: Use the PMAs for FAST, Spotlight checkpoints and unit assessments from Wonders, iReady  
 Math: iReady and Math Quarterlies  
 Science: Baseline/MidTerm and quarterly assessments  
 In addition, informal formative assessments will be used on a daily/weekly basis. Teachers will plan "checks for understanding" to make lesson adjustments and plan for small groups. (reteach, accelerate, enrich)

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** \*Daily implementation of independent thinking routines will be used in lessons across content.  
 \*Grade level teams will plan with instructional coaches to support content knowledge and development of questions, tasks, and assessments that yield data that allow the teacher to assess progress toward learning outcomes and provide for lesson adjustment.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** \*Visible thinking is about teaching students "thinking routines" to improve thinking and comprehension abilities. By making thinking visible students can discuss and reflect on their own thinking, as well as, the thinking of their peers.

**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.

Present BEST standards study dive, priorities and independent thinking routines to staff.

**Person Responsible** Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

Plan with coaches to strengthen content knowledge and thinking routines.

**Person Responsible** Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Weekly look-for thinking routines in classroom lessons. Provide feedback on implementation of strategies and results visible.

**Person Responsible** Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

SWD fell below the federal index of 41%. Last year we began the year with only one ESE teacher to help support students IEP goals. An additional teacher was hired mid year and schedules were adjusted to provide greater support to students with disabilities.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

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

By Spring of 2023, students in the SWD subgroup will have an overall federal index over 41%.

**Monitoring:**

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

ELA progress monitored through iReady diagnostic, Spotlight checks, and unit assessments. Math progress monitoring through iReady diagnostics, math quarterlies. Science progress monitoring through quarterly assessments. Quarterly IEP reviews with VE and Gen Ed teachers. VE Teachers attend planning sessions with grade levels served. In addition, informal informative assessments will be used on a daily/weekly basis.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

\*Daily implementation of independent thinking routines will be used in lessons across content.  
\*Grade level teams will plan with instructional coaches to support content knowledge and development of questions, tasks, and assessments that yield data that allow the teacher to assess student progress toward learning outcomes and provide for lesson adjustments. VE teachers will be part of these sessions and advocate for the needs of VE students in the planning session.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Visible thinking is about students "thinking routines" to improve thinking and comprehension abilities. By making thinking visible, students can discuss and reflect on their own thinking as well as the thinking of their peers.

**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.

Weekly look-for thinking routines in classroom lessons. Provide feedback on implementing of strategies and results visible.

**Person Responsible**

Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

Plan with coaches to strengthen content knowledge and select thinking routines.

**Person Responsible** Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Meet quarterly with leadership to review student progress toward gains and proficiency.

**Person Responsible** Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@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

The percentage of students scoring on grade level on the end-of-year view of iReady diagnostic in May was 39%.

Kindergarten: 60%

Grade 1: 34%

Grade 2: 24%

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

The percentage of students scoring 3 and above on the 2022 statewide, ELA assessment was 46%. This was an increase from the year prior.

**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)**

By Spring of 2023, 50% of our students in grades K-2 will perform at grade level according to the EOY Diagnostic of iReady.

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

By Spring of 2023, 50% of our students in grades 3-5 will score proficiently on the statewide FAST assessment.

**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.

Observation of instruction and feedback to instructional staff: Regular walk-throughs will take place and teachers will receive feedback on instructional practices related to moving students to proficiency. Monitoring FAST progress for grades 3-5: "Count" rosters will be organized so teachers are aware of students who will "count" toward the proficiency (Oct 14th). FAST assessments and other ELA assessments will be logged and reviewed in quarterly data chats. Monitoring iReady progress for grades K-2: Primary reading tutoring will be offered for students needing extra instruction outside of classroom time. Student progress will be monitored thru data chats in quarterly meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Forcucci, Kayla, [kayla.forcucci@hcps.net](mailto:kayla.forcucci@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?

\*Team planning: Grade level teams will plan with ELA or Admin to look specifically at the Benchmark and determine the strategy that will best support student learning.

\*Explicit Modeling: When teachers explicitly model the strategy and produce an exemplar, students then know what is expected and will be able to meet expectations.

\*Implementing purposeful questions, tasks, and assessments aligned to standards: When these components align with the rigor of the Benchmark then students are given the opportunity to perform grade level work and student achievement will more likely reflect proficiency.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

In 2022, the data showed students struggled to be proficient with grade level standards. The improvement strategy of team planning, explicit modeling, and implementing purposeful questions, tasks, and assessments aligned to benchmarks will yield evidence of student learning.

**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
<p>Literacy Coaching: Meet with school site coach to conduct a "planning for planning" session using the backward design model. During the session, the district resource teacher and site coach will plan a lesson with the end in mind while creating questions to support teachers in having a clear understanding of the questions, tasks, and assessments.</p>	<p>Burnside, Kristin, kristin.burnside@hcps.net</p>
<p>Collaboration: Collaborate with teachers during weekly planning session to focus on the following components of the backward planning model: creating the mini assessment, creating benchmark based tasks to provide opportunities to students to demonstrate learning and craft purposeful questions to encourage student discourse around the content while applying the strategy to meet the demands of the benchmark.</p>	<p>Burnside, Kristin, kristin.burnside@hcps.net</p>
<p>Identify teachers to engage in job embedded coteaching professional development utilizing the lesson study model.</p>	<p>Kim, Catherine, catherine.kim@hcps.net</p>
<p>Embed professional development around modeling of reading strategies to support reading behaviors during current collaborative planning sessions each week.</p>	<p>Burnside, Kristin, kristin.burnside@hcps.net</p>

### 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.

Wilson's Wildcats of Honor program is based in citizenship and patriotism. Our character development plan is established through a house system based on 4 character traits: Courage, Integrity, Commitment, and Giving. We have the "Essential 15" actions which support our 3R's. Teachers use these essentials throughout the classroom and school so expectations are clear and consistent through out the campus. Students are rewarded for displaying the Essentials/3Rs and encouraged to build up each other when they see them following them. These schoolwide essentials are visible to all students, parents, and visitors.

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

All staff are involved in modeling, promoting, and reinforcing the essentials. They award daily points for students seen demonstrating behaviors. Monthly recognition for the lead house is done during the cafeteria lunch time. Business partners contribute to the treats given for the monthly awards and contribute to suggestions during the SAC.