Potter Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Potter Elementary School

3224 E CAYUGA ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Dames

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Potter Elementary School

3224 E CAYUGA ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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	96%

School Grades History

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

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.

Mission:
To provide an education where students are pushed to their potential and beyond both academically and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Vision:

Potter Eagles lead with loyalty, empathy, ambition and determination to reach for high achievement

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
Waite, Sharon	Principal	Instructional Leader. Engages all stakeholders to improve student achievement.
Mann, Annika	Assistant Principal	Supports the role of the Principal, Also an instructional leader who supports curriculum and assessment needs of the school.
Broughton, Leikeisha	Behavior Specialist	Supports and ensures the School WIde Behavior plan and MTSS is followed with fidelity. Models best behavior practices Hs-5th Grade.
Castillo, Monica	Instructional Coach	Teaches 5th Grade ELA. On the other half of the day models, coaches and plans with teachers in 4th and 5th for best practices in ELA. Is a support to teachers in K-4 also.
Dickens, Brandi	Instructional Coach	Teaches 5th Grade Math. On the other half of the day models, coaches and plans with teachers in 4th and 5th for best practices in Math. Is a support to teachers in K-4 also.
Hogue-Brown, Sachia	Reading Coach	Ensures fidelity of instruction in Reading. Plans, models and coaches with K-3, also supports 4th and 5th. Analyzes school wide data. Achieve 3000 and IReady coordinator.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Jennifer Dames

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
37

Total number of students enrolled at the school
445

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	54	73	48	78	60	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	1	31	20	30	19	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
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	46	34	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	17	9	31	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	8	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	3	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/26/2022

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	46	53	79	77	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	28	13	19	27	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	18	30	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	4	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	66	46	53	79	77	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	28	13	19	27	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	18	30	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	4	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	19%	53%	56%				19%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	61%	61%				37%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	54%	52%				38%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	37%	60%	60%				29%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%	69%	64%				50%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	78%	61%	55%				62%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	12%	49%	51%				27%	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	16%	52%	-36%	58%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	12%	55%	-43%	58%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	20%	54%	-34%	56%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

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	22%	54%	-32%	62%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	28%	57%	-29%	64%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	60%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	23%	51%	-28%	53%	-30%
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	12	45	60	14	57	67					
ELL	27	38		37	71						
BLK	17	48	60	35	70	81	9				
HSP	23	46		43	67		17				
FRL	19	49	61	37	71	81	12				

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	17	57		26	57		9				
ELL	27			23							
BLK	18	48		35	63	70	8				
HSP	36			32							
FRL	22	54	86	35	61	79	15				

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		23	42	10	45	62					
ELL	30			60							
BLK	13	36	43	22	42	58	12				
HSP	42	35		58	82		40				
MUL	40			60							
WHT	33			42	70						
FRL	19	36	38	29	50	61	27				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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	42
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
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?

Students are making gains but not meeting the mark in proficiency.
Reading proficiency 19% - a drop of 2% from previous year
Science proficiency 12% - a drop of 3% from previous year

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

Reading - 19% Proficiency
Science 12% Proficiency

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

Lack of reading foundation skills and reading engagement. Teach foundation skills/ interventions given in small groups.

Lack of consistent instruction in Science Teaching K-5. Ensure everyone is teaching science K-5, standards aligned instruction

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

Math Learning Gains and Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains

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

Targeted instruction based on monthly math assessments - data driven instruction.

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

Intensive interventions to close achievement gaps

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.

Standard alignment based PD, Learning outcomes and aggressive monitoring of the standard taught

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

After school Extended Learning Program and intensive groups pulled during the day.

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: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Description: Student achievement will increase when students are consistently engaged in rigorous instruction focused on the new Florida BEST Standards. Rationale: Due to the new BEST Standards we want to ensure teacher's understanding of the grade level BEST standards and how to plan effectively to ensure lesson alignment.With the implementation of the new BEST standards we feel that further in-depth instructional practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned instruction is essential.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By December 2022, at least 70% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to be engaged in standards aligned tasks. By Spring 2023, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to be engaged in standards aligned tasks. As a result, student data will show: At least 25% of students (3rd-5th) will be proficient in Reading as evidenced by scoring in the on level or above category on the Spring PMA 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Daily walkthroughs with actionable feedback by Admin team based on a classroom walkthrough tool aligned to the instructional priority; which included lesson planning during the PLC Sessions and components of the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction/ Get Better Faster. Teachers will be tiered and provided differentiated coaching. Monthly student Math and ELA Wonder Unit Assessments taken and analyzed to inform instruction. Data discussed in PLCs/DDI process
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sharon Waite (sharon.waite@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1.Professional learning communities will be focused on standards-based planning, student work analysis, analyzing data from common assessments. Standards based planning/PLCs in ELA, Math and Science with a focus on teacher clarity of the learning standard and assessment monitoring to ensure its mastery. 2. Use of walkthrough data to determine coaching next steps. 3.On going observation and feedback to teachers by Administration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	We will use our standards-based planning PLC's to strengthen teacher instructional practice in order to raise student achievement.

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

K-5 Teachers will participate in collaborative internalization PLC sessions to deepen teachers content knowledge of upcoming standards-based instruction

K-5 teachers will attend and be empowered to facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions to align the

lessons with the grade level standards.

Common planning time for Standards based planning and Data PLCS. (50 mins daily) will ensure that teachers are planning with instructional coaches in order to align the lessons with the grade level standards.
Use structures and expectations, roles and responsibilities for planning to ensure time is maximized and lessons are prepared for daily instruction.
Empower teacher leaders to lead planning/data PLCS to build teacher capacity and ensure teachers have a solid understanding of the standards.

K-5 Teachers will participate in Data Driven PLCS after assessments to inform their instruction. Data chats and goals will be set with each student.

Conduct learning walks for teachers to observe peers who are strong with teacher clarity and or aggressive monitoring of standards mastery. Additionally, these walk throughs will assist in the PLC Planning sessions to align standards with instruction.

Monitoring:
1. Admin and coaches will attend planning sessions and PLCS and provide feedback
2. Admin and coaches will conduct learning walks to collect data trends and provide individual feedback

Person Responsible   Sharon Waite (sharon.waite@hcps.net)

Hire 1 Reading and a Math Coach -. The Coaches will focus on coaching, modeling, and lesson planning with teachers in grades K-3, with emphasis on teacher clarity and aggressive monitoring. The coaching and modeling will occur weekly under the supervision of the school Admin team. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of coaching. The Coaches will meet weekly with teachers in grades K-5 to plan effective lessons based on grade level standards to meet the needs of students in grades K-5.

Hire a TTD for math and one for ELA - The TTD will focus on being a model ELA/Math 5th Grade classroom for half of the day and the other half will focus on coaching, modeling and lesson planning with teachers in grades 4-5.

Use look Fors data form for the areas of focus - teacher clarity and aggressive monitoring, providing daily feedback to assist with PLC planning sessions for teacher mastery.

Provide professional learning through ILT based upon the look Fors and observation data to include: scaffolding question around teacher clarity, monitoring student progress towards the mastery of the standards.

Monthly Refresh/Reflect PD based on observation/Data. What we saw, what was positive (strategy spotlight), What we need to improve.

Monitoring of our ESSA Subgroups to make sure they are meeting their goals.

Monitoring:
1. Admin and coaches will attend planning sessions/ ILT and PD sessions and provide feedback and follow up with observations and support.
2. Admin and coaches will conduct learning walks to collect data trends and provide individual feedback and follow up with support.

Person Responsible   Sharon Waite (sharon.waite@hcps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to building relationships with the belief that all students can learn.	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students' achievement will increase when we focus on relationships paired with the belief that all students can learn.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	School district referrals will be reduced by 25% by May 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	MTSS B meetings once a month to monitor behavior data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sharon Waite (sharon.waite@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Establish school wide behavior plan 2. Establish clear structures for analyzing and responding to behavior data 3. Implement Community School model based on the 6 pillars to improve community relationships
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	We will use our School Wide Behavior Plan to strengthen teacher / student relationships.

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.

Hire a RTI Resource Teacher to assist with the School wide behavior plan and interventions.
K-5 Teachers will implement the School Wide House System with fidelity and implement daily Community Building Sessions to continue to strengthen strong Tier 1 systems.
All staff will implement Potter's Check and Connect system for identified students receiving tier 2 and 3 support.
Teacher and parental communication will be strengthened through PBIS rewards system.
Empower students to actively participate in student leadership roles
Implement Restorative practices to build/improve relationships between students and educators
Participate in a book study with the book Discipline with Dignity (Mendler, Mendler & Curwin)
Establish school wide mentoring program

Person Responsible	Sharon Waite (sharon.waite@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

Students will be assessed at the start of the year using the district baseline assessments. Data will be analyzed in PLCs to ensure students receive the interventions they need through the MTSS process. Foundational skills lessons will be planned within the ELA block to ensure student learning gaps are addressed early. Support will also be provided by the Reading Coach, Teacher Talent Developer , RTI Resource Teacher and the ELL Resource teacher. Students will use i-Ready Reading to provide additional tailored support. Data will be constantly tracked to ensure that our student's needs are met.

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

Students will be assessed at the start of the year using district baseline assessments. Data will be analyzed in PLCs to ensure students receive the interventions they need through the MTSS process. Support will also be provided by the Reading Coach, Teacher Talent Developer , RTI Resource Teacher and the ELL Resource teacher. Students will use i-Ready Reading and Achieve 3000 to provide additional tailored support. Data will be constantly tracked to ensure student's needs are met.

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)

At least 25% of students in grade K, 1 and 2 will be proficient on the progress monitoring assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

At least 25% of students in grade 3, 4 and 5 will be proficient on the progress monitoring 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.

Students will take the i-Ready Reading diagnostic three times within the school year to track progress. We will also use the assessments within Wonders to assess student performance on the standards based items. Achieve level set will be conducted three times as well in grades 3-5 to monitor progress.

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

Waite, Sharon, sharon.waite@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. §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?

Students will use i-Ready Reading in grades K-5 and Achieve 3000 in grades 3-5 on a daily basis as part of their reading rotation. Students who have phonics deficiencies will receive additional small group instruction. This is in
addition to on grade level content presented using the Wonders Curriculum and i-Ready tool box resources.

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?

The interventions in small group instructions last year showed success in the percentage of students who may not of been proficient in reading did make a year's growth.

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
Identify students who are not meeting proficiency through the MTSS process and develop a schedule for intervention. Assess the students to determine the appropriate instructional intervention. Group the students based on need and determine who will provide the interventions and when. Analyze data every 6 weeks to track student progress.	Waite, Sharon, sharon.waite@hcps.net
Conduct walkthroughs during imTSS time and also small group reading time to monitor effectiveness of the interventions. Feedback will be provided to teachers and data will be analyzed to determine next steps for professional development for teachers.	Waite, Sharon, sharon.waite@hcps.net

Positive Culture & Environment
A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Potter Elementary has just completed year 3 as a Community School under the NEA model. Potter Elementary is the hub of our community. We provide various resources and supports to families through purposeful partnerships and community connections based on data collected through a deep needs/asset assessment from all stakeholder groups (students, staff, family, community members). For example we partner with Feeding Tampa Bay, Tampa Bay Bucs and The Dairy Council to provide a fully stocked food pantry for our community, open 3 times a week.
We promote a positive culture by using our House System under the PBIS Model. We have 4 houses and each student and staff member is assigned to one house: Loyalty, Empathy, Ambition and Determination (Building LEADers) Students collect House points by showing their Eagle PRIDE (Prepared, Respect, Independent, Disciplined, Excellence) and each week and month the house with the winning points is acknowledged/celebrated.
As a community we established our three core values: 1. Put students first in every decision we make, 2.

Lead with love and 3. Do whatever it takes to ensure our students succeed.
We work in partnership with Frameworks of Tampa Bay (currently in Year 2) where we work with students and parents together.

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

Administrators - Will lead all stakeholders with establishing clear vision/mission statement and core values and ensuring a safe environment

PBIS and Restorative Practices will be supported by the Students Services Team and Frameworks of Tampa Bay and implemented by the teachers.

SAC Team - SAC Chairperson, Admin, and SAC Team Members

Parents- support students and have open lines of communication with teachers and administration

Community Resource Teacher and Community Partners- provide the supports needed