

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Woodbridge Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Woodbridge Elementary School

8301 WOODBRIDGE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ana "Victoria" Morse

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (50%)
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Woodbridge Elementary School

8301 WOODBRIDGE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[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	91%

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.

Show our Wildcat PRIDE by:

P- Be a Problem Solver

R- Take Responsibility for my actions

I- Invest care in myself and others.

D- Show Determination to reach my goals.

E- Give my best Effort.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building a Foundation for the Future.

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
Morse, Victoria	Principal	Supervisor of all day to day processes on campus. She is also the lead instructional specialist, runs the budget, and gives all final evaluations on teachers and staff.
Lee, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Assessment coordinator, data coordinator, instructional feedback, professional development, discipline, and schoolwide data.
Reinhart, Jackie	Math Coach	Facilitates planning, data chats, Content PLCs, and student intervention groups, coaching cycles, supports TIP/Top teachers.
Chacon, Claudia	ELL Compliance Specialist	Oversees all ELL testing, student plans, coordinates parent meetings, manages ELL data
Kirkland, Eliana	Other	Schoolwide Behavior and MTSS facilitation
Kulyik, Lissette	Other	Oversees all ESE activities, PD for ESE, paperwork compliance, MTSS
Scalzi, Diane	SAC Member	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Ana "Victoria" Morse

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

656

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

21

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

7

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	87	88	106	103	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
Attendance below 90 percent	1	27	29	27	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
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	58	49	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	39	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
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	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	1	1	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/17/2022

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	82	90	102	110	91	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	577
Attendance below 90 percent	37	29	43	37	35	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	26	30	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	82	90	102	110	91	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	577	
Attendance below 90 percent	37	29	43	37	35	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
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	26	30	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	40%	53%	56%				47%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						53%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						40%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	49%	50%	50%				49%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						53%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						30%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	59%	59%				43%	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	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	50%	57%	-7%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	36%	51%	-15%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	19	43	45	24	61	63	29				
ELL	41	51	50	47	73	60	28				
BLK	21			43							
HSP	40	52	50	48	71	68	31				
MUL	19	17		25	50						
WHT	54	64		71	86						
FRL	38	50	53	49	72	66	32				
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	19	22	18	22	44		33				
ELL	42	69	62	38	33		39				
BLK	40			35							
HSP	40	60	53	38	26	25	39				
MUL	35			22							
WHT	44			50							
FRL	41	59	52	39	31	35	37				
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	36	48	29	41	53	38	40				
ELL	36	48	40	38	44	27	7				
BLK	47	50		37	50						
HSP	44	54	43	47	50	27	37				
MUL	64			82							
WHT	52	56		52	58						
FRL	47	54	42	49	52	30	44				

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	53
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	28
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
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	53
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?

Math overall learning gains and bottom quartile increased. ELA overall gains and bottom quartile decreased.

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

ELA is an area of need based on the data. Trends across the school show informational text was stronger than literature due to curriculum. Vocabulary will need a continued focus for students in all subgroups.

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

There is a need for staff to be open and willing to try new instructional strategies and implement with fidelity.

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

Math showed the most improvement based on all data.

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

A strategic focus on small groups, lunch bunches, grade level collaborative planning. Math routines were consistent along with expectations clear to students.

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

Grade level collaborative planning with a focus on planning for subgroups.

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.

Engagement strategies, state literacy support from Denise Toler, small group instruction, vocabulary instruction, job embedded pd with teachers observing each other to build teacher capacity, Teach Me Tuesdays.

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

RAISE tutors will be providing one on one support to students with progress monitoring to track effectiveness. The high school students will visit one day a week for six weeks at a time. Ongoing mini-pd at the beginning of each faculty meeting to provide support with instructional priorities. DRT will continue to support planning and building teacher capacity to lead PD, support, etc.

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 Student Engagement

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Instructional Priority: Teachers will design lessons to include activities that require students to think at a higher-level and encourage active participation in learning.

Rationale: 2021-2022 Teacher observation data shows student engagement rated lowest at 50% accomplished. Walkthrough trends show whole group instruction lasting long with students observed in a passive role with direct instruction used by teachers.

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

In 2023, 50% of students will be proficient in reading. 60% of students will make learning gains in Reading and 72% of the lowest 25 will make learning gains in reading.

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

Instructional practices will be monitored during the weekly Academic Leadership Meeting with coaches and administrators. The team will discuss planning notes, teacher tiers data from administrative walkthroughs focused on small group instruction and acceleration of grade level content. Based on learning walks, weekly observation and feedback cycles will happen for core content teachers with 90% or better effectively implementing engagement strategies during Tier 1 (whole group) instruction. Look-fors will be determined based on the Radar Plan aligned with Classroom Teacher Evaluation Rubric.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Morse (victoria.morse@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. Use of data (formal and informal) to plan for and increase student participation and engagement.
2. Use of data (formal and informal) to provide scaffolded strategies during core and small group for accelerated learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific

Based on Hattie's research, engagement strategies such as Jigsaw method has an effect size on student achievement of 1.20, scaffolding grade level content has an effect size of .82, and .82. These strategies will engage students cognitively and encourage active participation.

strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Person
Responsible Kimberly Lee (kimberly.lee@hcps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Teachers will implement community circles daily to establish a safe and welcoming culture of learning. All faculty, staff and students will participate in PBIS to engage in a school wide culture of high expectations and collaboration.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with 1 or more suspensions will decrease from 3% to 1%.

Monitoring:

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

The RTI Resource teacher will meet weekly with the Student Services team to analyze behavior data from Behavior Tracker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eliana Kirkland (eliana.kirkland@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. Proactive Talking Circles during Morning Meeting 2. Positive Behavior Support through PBIS Schoolwide Plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

According to Eric Jensen, students in poverty who have experienced trauma thrive in systems that provide consistent and reliable structures. He also states that students must be taught how to interact and cope to achieve success.

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.

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

Teachers will positively reinforce individual student behavior by rewarding students with Woodbridge dollars. Students will earn Woodbridge dollars to spend weekly, monthly and quarterly. Weekly: Students can purchase items from the teacher. Monthly: Students can purchase entry to the Behavior Reward Event.

Person Responsible

Eliana Kirkland (eliana.kirkland@hcps.net)

#3. 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.

Teachers will leverage data to plan for and implement small group instruction using appropriate strategies to accelerate learning of on grade level content in reading.

In 2022 only 40% of students were proficient in Reading. Furthermore, In 2022, only 51% of students made gains in Reading. In 2022, ESSA Subgroup of black students show 32% of students made gains. It is evident that small group instruction is needed to provide access to and acceleration of grade level content.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

In 2023, 50% of students will be proficient in reading. 60% of students will make learning gains in Reading and 72% of the lowest 25 will make learning gains in reading. Black students will increase their proficiency to at least 42% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs conducted by Administration and Coaches will be used to monitor implementation and teacher's effective use of small group instruction. Actionable feedback will be given on Microsoft Forms.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Morse (victoria.morse@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will receive targeted small group instruction in on grade level content, using research based instructional techniques to support students at all levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Based on Hattie's research small group instruction has an effect size on student achievement of .47, scaffolding grade level content has an effect size of .82, and RTI (Response to Intervention) has an effect size of 1.29. These strategies will support the development of high-quality, small group instruction and deepen teachers' understanding of grade level content and standards. This will ensure students receive instruction aligned to the expectations of grade level standards while scaffolded to meet the individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Administrators, RTI Resource Teacher, ELL Resource Teacher, Reading Resource Teacher, and Math Coach will meet weekly to review walkthrough data, plan for teacher planning sessions and coaching cycles, and determine next steps for professional development opportunities.

Administration, Resource Teachers, and Math Coach will facilitate weekly grade level PLCs to build teacher knowledge of grade level content and expectations in ELA. Teachers will learn strategies to scaffold grade level content during small group instruction so students receive appropriate strategies and supports, including accommodations and modifications where appropriate, to engage with rigorous work. Grade level PLCs will be scheduled on Tuesdays.

ILT and Math Coach will facilitate weekly grade level planning sessions in the morning with class coverage to plan for small group instruction in ELA. This additional planning time will allow coaches and teachers to plan lessons that align with the standards for the grade or addressing specific skill deficiencies that hold them back from doing grade-level work. Small group lessons will include questions and tasks that provide opportunities for students to respond to and build on one another's thinking throughout the lesson to deepen their understanding of the content. The questions, tasks, or assessments planned during this planning time will yield data that allow the teacher to assess students' progress toward learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards and provides for further lesson adjustments. The lesson plans will also include opportunity for teachers to deliberately check for understanding throughout the lesson and adapt the lesson according to student understanding. Teachers will plan for the use of visuals and anchor charts to support students at all levels.

**Person
Responsible**

Kimberly Lee (kimberly.lee@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

Teachers will leverage data to plan for and implement small group instruction using appropriate strategies to accelerate learning of on grade level content in reading.

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

Teachers will leverage data to plan for and implement small group instruction using appropriate strategies to accelerate learning of on grade level content in reading.

Measurable Outcomes:

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

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

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2023 51% of students will be proficient in reading on STAR Literacy Assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2023 51% of students will be proficient in reading on FAST Assessments.

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.

Classroom walkthroughs conducted by Administration and Coaches will be used to monitor implementation and teacher's effective use of small group instruction. Actionable feedback will be given on Microsoft Forms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Morse, Victoria, victoria.morse@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?

Based on Hattie's research small group instruction has an effect size on student achievement of .47, scaffolding grade level content has an effect size of .82, and RTI (Response to Intervention) has an effect size of 1.29.

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?

These strategies will support the development of high-quality, small group instruction and deepen teachers' understanding of grade level content and standards. This will ensure students receive instruction aligned to the expectations of grade level standards while scaffolded to meet the individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Targeted classroom walkthroughs by administration and coaches will be conducted weekly during small group instruction and RTI to provide in-the-moment coaching and actionable feedback to improve instructional practice. Leadership Team will meet weekly to review walkthrough data, plan for teacher planning sessions and coaching cycles, and determine next steps for professional development opportunities.	
Professional learning will be incorporated to build teacher capacity with engagement strategies. Faculty Meetings will provide bite-sized PD with ELA Walkthroughs calendared with State Literacy Leader to observe implementation of new learning and will occur regularly.	Morse, Victoria, victoria.morse@hcps.net
Job embedded PD will provide teachers an opportunity to observe colleagues with instructional practices and differentiate support based on needs.	

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.

- Character building lessons, Restorative Practices, and the development of a mentor program will help children develop internal understanding, self-control, and a desire to follow the rules.
2. Ongoing Grade level PLC Collaborative Planning to monitor student progress and discuss Tier 2 and 3 students.
 3. Students will demonstrate their ownership in their behavior and earn Pride Dollars for positive behavior.
 4. Schoolwide PBIS Training for students.
 5. PBIS Team will monitor the implementation of Tier 1 interventions and support.
 5. Monthly Positive Behavior Rewards for students.

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

The School Compact and Schoolwide Behavior Plan supports proactive positive strategies that all stakeholders play a role in at the school. Ongoing communication through the use of Parentlink, monthly newsletters, SAC Meetings, and PTA Meetings, will enhance parent communication and school culture. Parent and Staff surveys provided feedback to Administration to implement changes for parents to be more engaged in their child's learning. Based on a staff survey administered during the summer, as well as the Insight Survey, PBIS was implemented to support the Schoolwide Behavior Plan and revised committees were created, gaining buy-in from stakeholders.