

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Wimauma 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Wimauma Elementary School

5709 HICKMAN ST, Wimauma, FL 33598

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Lebron Lebron Bravo

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)	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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%)
<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>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Wimauma Elementary School

5709 HICKMAN ST, Wimauma, FL 33598

[ 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	90%

### 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.

To strengthen our community by educating, nurturing, and inspiring students to reach their greatest potential.

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

To create a school that is highly regarded for its academic excellence, and for its contribution in actively serving and improving the community in which it operates.

### 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
Lebron-Bravo, Ismael	Principal	To monitor, contribute data, and provide suggestions to instructional lessons provided by the staff. Ongoing feedback is given to all staff members. Also to handle the day to day operations of managing a school.
Fletcher, Karen	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with instruction, observation, and operations of the school.
Gordon, Suzanne	SAC Member	2nd grade Classroom teacher and the SAC Chair

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Lebron Lebron Bravo

**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.*

1

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

6

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

24

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

522

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

2

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

3

### 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	63	80	72	94	80	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	0	27	26	24	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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	47	52	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	48	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
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	1	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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

Monday 8/29/2022

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	66	68	82	92	71	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465
Attendance below 90 percent	22	27	17	21	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	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	
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	15	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	18	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
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	1	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**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	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	66	68	82	92	71	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465
Attendance below 90 percent	22	27	17	21	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	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	
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	15	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	18	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
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	1	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**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	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	29%	53%	56%				34%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						50%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						56%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	40%	50%	50%				45%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%						54%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						41%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	59%	59%				52%	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	31%	52%	-21%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	55%	-10%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	21%	54%	-33%	56%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	41%	54%	-13%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
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	18	44	29	21	54	42	28				
ELL	28	39	31	37	60	60	49				
HSP	30	45	34	41	61	58	53				
WHT	29	46		47	46						
FRL	28	44	38	40	59	51	48				

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	14	10		12	15		27				
ELL	25	31	28	28	33	44	40				
HSP	32	35	25	32	34	45	49				
WHT	14			40							
FRL	31	35	23	32	34	41	49				
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	6	48	57	23	47	37	36				
ELL	28	44	56	42	51	36	45				
BLK	44	53		32	41						
HSP	32	49	55	45	53	37	50				
WHT	48	61		57	70						
FRL	32	48	56	43	53	41	51				

### 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	47
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	47
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	49
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	42
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

When reviewing the 2021-2022 FSA data and comparing it the FSA Data for the 2021-2022 school year the level of proficiency in ELA decreased from 31% to 29% (2 point decrease). However, when reviewing the other components that students are measured on FSA, there were significant gains in Mathematics and ELA. In ELA under the component of learning gains there was an increase from 34% to 44% (10 points) and under the bottom quartile there was an increase from 23% to 35% (12 points). The achievement level increased from 33% to 40% (7 points) in Mathematics. Learning gains increased from 34% to 59% (25 points) in Mathematics and in the bottom quartile there was an increase from 41% to 51% (10 points). Fifth grade Science did remain the same at 49% between the 2021 and 2022 state test.

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

The data component that showed the greatest need for improvement is in the are of ELA Achievement. Students have shown a decrease in achieving the level of proficiency in grades 3, 4, and 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?

Wimauma Elementary has a large number of students who come from homes that English is not the primary language spoken in the home. Families primary language used in the home is typically Spanish or may also speak dialects from Southern Mexico and Central America. As a school we need implement strategies that ensure all lessons focus on grade level standards and provide teachers with opportunity to actively monitor students progress to the standards.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was in the learning gains of Mathematics. There was a 25 point increase (34% to 59%) across grades three through five.

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

Common planning time was created in the schedule that allowed for teachers to meet and discuss standards that students were struggling with. After school tutoring was provided to students who could make gains based off data from the previous year.

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

Select planning tools to support teachers with the effective planning of core which would be transferred to whole and small group instruction. Through the use of the tools, a clear connection with the target and task alignment will be built, and teachers will develop and align tasks students will complete to demonstrate an understanding. These task will include short responses, collaborative questions, and collaborative strategies that can make learning visible.

**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.**

Every Monday a primary and intermediate grade will meet to have collaborative planning. By allowing the planning to occur teachers will no longer work in isolation and can discuss trends and misconceptions that students have. Instructional priorities will be created and used by administration to monitor instruction. Feedback should reflect what is collected and shared with grade levels.

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

There will be data rooms for both ELA and Mathematics to host PLC's/Planning sessions. Data used to track and monitor students progress will be based of the K-2 Screener, iReady, and district assessments. PLC's with members of the Leadership Team will occur every Monday with primary and intermediate grade levels.

#### **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.**

Based on the FASA 2021-2022 FSA ELA scores for grades three through five scoring proficiency was 29%. This was a decrease of two points from the previous year. Even though there was a decrease in the number of students scoring at proficiency, level 3 or higher, students were able to make substantial learning gains and those in the bottom quartile were able to move.

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

Percentage of students in grades three through five achieving a level 3 or higher on the ELA portion of the FAST Assessment will increase from 29% to 35%.

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

This will be monitored with the use of the FAST PMA's and iReady that will be completed throughout the year. Progress monitor will also consist with the use of the Spotlight Checkpoint Units the are given in the ELA block.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ismael Lebron-Bravo (ismael.lebron-bravo@hcps.net)

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

The Reading Coach with support teachers during PLC's/Planning. A primary and intermediate grades that are assigned to teach ELA will meet on Monday's to review data and devise a plan for collaborative planning and provide next steps as needed.

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

Data supports that there is a need to focus to strengthen the core instruction. Text selected and used should support the target and task that students are working on. Teachers will need to consider the challenges that the text may bring certain students in terms of language, content, and overall readability. Teachers will be able to plan for individual scaffolding which would include specific instructional delivery model, areas for modeling and explicit instruction, questions to guide students thinking and opportunities for students collaboration.

**selecting this strategy.****Action Steps to Implement**

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

Establish a common time for each grade level to plan lessons with the coach and understand the standards. Invited to the planning time could be ELL, ESE, Gifted and others that service students in the grades. This common planning time would occur at a set time weekly and focus on lesson development and planning.

**Person****Responsible**

Ismael Lebron-Bravo (ismael.lebron-bravo@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**

-

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

-

**Measurable Outcomes:**

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

-

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

-

**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.

-

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**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?

-

### **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?

### **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**

### **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.**

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