Robinson Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
resources
growth

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Robinson Elementary School

4801 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33567

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Timothy Delgado

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (47%) 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	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.](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

Robinson Elementary School

4801 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33567

[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	72%

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.

J. S. Robinson will provide all students the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

J. S. Robinson will provide all students the best education in the county.

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/2/2022, Timothy Delgado

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/11/2022

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	63	73	75	80	96	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	13	5	4	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	10	13	39	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	63	73	75	80	96	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	13	5	4	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	10	13	39	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	35%	53%	56%				45%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						55%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						53%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	50%	50%				50%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						54%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						38%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	59%	59%				37%	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	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

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	39%	54%	-15%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	32%	51%	-19%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	27	49	52	42	58	57	22				
ELL	27	50	58	46	73	68	18				
BLK	45			55							
HSP	32	54	63	51	73	63	27				
WHT	40	51	42	53	71	50	36				
FRL	35	54	57	52	72	63	29				

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	26	37	47	33	43	35	19				
ELL	26	34	47	31	42	35	20				
BLK	36			45							
HSP	33	39	48	38	48	39	27				
WHT	49	39		49	58		47				
FRL	35	38	48	38	48	39	26				

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	34	45	44	44	61	42	26				
ELL	35	51	48	44	58	45	18				
BLK	44	45		38	27						
HSP	39	52	51	46	54	43	29				
WHT	59	62	50	61	59	20	49				
FRL	42	54	52	48	53	40	33				

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	51
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	51
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	49
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	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 have decreased from 47% to 35% in proficiency in ELA since 2018. Science proficiency remains below the state and district average at 31%. In third grade 17% of Hispanic and ELL scored a 3 or higher on FSA. In grades 3, 4, and 5, only 29% percent were proficient in ELA. 26% of ELL students were proficient. There is a significant finding, only 4% of ESE students were proficient and 22% of Hispanic students were proficient on the Science FSA assessment.

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

Data components used to monitor students progress is Florida Statewide Assessments (FSA).

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

Teacher efficacy in content knowledge. Fidelity of teaching standards based instruction. New actions put in place will be co-planning between the ESE, ELL, and lead teacher, for specific sub groups showing greatest deficits. We will implement student centered teaching practices with differentiated instruction based on current data. Student conferencing and progress monitoring will be held accountable quarterly.

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

Looking at 2022 data, our ELA bottom quartile gains were 57%. The overall ELA gains were 53%. Our Math gains scores increased twenty points from 52% to 72%. Our bottom quartile in Math increased 16% percentile points.

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

Factors contributing to improvement were collaborative planning, spiral reviews, goal setting, monthly common assessments, data analysis, backward and accelerated planning, identifying gaps in instruction and consistent in differentiated instruction.

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

Incorporating lessons to include prerequisites standards in order to connect learning, to accelerate in order to address on-grade level standards. Based on students needs, we will use strategic small groups, cooperative learning, student led discussion structure, and conferencing. Teachers will actively reflect on

student outcomes to drive daily instruction.
.

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

Professional development in word study and vocabulary, student led discussion, active engagement strategies, using data to drive instruction. Resource staff and coaches can collaborate with teachers through planning, coaching cycles, reflective feedback centered around student needs connected to data analysis.

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

Co teaching models with subject specific coaches to monitor standard instruction in phonics, fluency, comprehension, recall of facts, problem solving strategies, etc. Peer coaching opportunities to observe each other targeting best practices.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	We will relentlessly focus on developing teacher efficacy through collaborative planning of standard based instruction; including differentiation and setting measurable goals for targeted groups, followed up with conferencing with students; to increase proficiency and student gains across all grade levels. Walk through feedback by content coaches and administrative observations will be conducted regularly to progress monitor and ensure teachers are supported with fidelity.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase overall student proficiency and gains measured by quarterly math monitoring tools, ELA unit checkpoints, Wonder screeners, Imagine Learning and state STAR/FAST/FSAA assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Proficiency will be monitored through quarterly data chats and professional learning communities to identify weaknesses and specific students who are falling two levels below proficiency. Any students who fall in this category will be identified and a specific action plan will be in place.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	-Content coach support -ESE support -ELL support -Consistent small groups to focus on targeted areas of grow -Professional development presented based on data and needs -Inclusion of parents and community in decision-making and content understanding
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	To strengthen our collaborative approach through professional supports with coaches, ESE teachers, and ELL support to work as a more cohesive unit. Its a priority to include all stakeholders in decision making; parents, community, administration, teachers, and coaches.

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.

Collaborative Planning
Ongoing Instructional Feedback through walkthroughs by Instructional coaches and administration

Quarterly Assessments
Job Embedded Professional Development

Person Responsible   Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Increased support of our ELL students due to the learning gaps and gains not meeting proficiency. Classroom teacher will embed ESOL strategies throughout core instruction across content. ESOL resource teacher will provide job embedded professional development coupled with collaborative planning to support classroom teachers. ELL staff will be visibly present in the classroom weekly to work with students in small group and assist them with their learning. Imagine Learning interventions will be in place and monitored for identified students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Create a culture of shared accountability through aligned standard based instruction through B.E.S.T standards to increase proficiency in student gains across all grade levels for ELL students.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This will be monitored through collaborative data analysis and planning sessions weekly. Leaders and instructors will review monthly data of proficiency and gains. Teacher Observations of learning activities, conferencing with feedback and progress monitoring will be in place.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will be guided to use Ellevation strategies in the classroom to support language acquisition. Small group interventions will be administered daily. Administration will conduct fidelity checks of instructional support services and core ELL strategies and follow up with regular feedback on progress and improved instructional practices. We will Increase parental representation through monthly communication of learning objectives and standards being taught through emails, newsletters etc. Having parent representatives attend monthly SAC meetings and be involved in decision making. Professional development to support culturally responsive instruction by our ELL specialist. Increased analysis of progress monitoring data in weekly planning sessions and monthly PLC's.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	The need to: -increase students gains through collaborative culturally responsive practice -increase support and communication among students, families, and instructional stakeholders.

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.

Progress Monitor and Data Analysis Quarterly
Communication between parents and all stakeholders
Weekly walkthroughs from administration, specialists, and content coaches
Increase Family/Curriculum Nights

Person Responsible   Katherine Gilmore (katherine.gilmore@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	After reviewing data from the 2022 school year, we are in critical need to improve students proficiency in Science. We will focus on improving in depth collaborative planning in Science instruction and using common assessments weekly. We will implement hands on engaging activities to connect learning and help students apply concepts. We will monitor students progress monthly through content mini assessments
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal is to increase overall proficiency in Science as measured by the SSA assessment and frequent progress monitoring.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Quarterly progress monitoring assessments. Mini assessments Student Learning Outcomes Teacher Observations SSA assessment at the end of grade level
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Collaborative Planning Long-term Investigations Fidelity Checks Nature of Science Application Real World Connections Hands on Experiments to enhance engagement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	To strengthen our collaborative planning techniques aligned with standards, engage students and hold them accountable for learning through science notebooks, collecting data, student led discussions, and writing conclusions.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly team planning aligned with Science standards
Monthly Science PLC's
Grade Level Long Term Investigations
Student Interactive Science Notebooks
Weekly communication of learning goals/content focus

Person Responsible   Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on Spring 2022 I-Ready diagnostic Reading scores, 61% of students in Kindergarten, 43% in first grade, and 45% of students in 2nd grade scored at proficiency or higher for the end of the year grade level benchmarks. These percentages are indicators of the percentage of students on-track for scoring a level 3 or above on statewide, standardized assessments.

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

Based on 2022 ELA FSA Scores 32% of grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is a level 3 or higher. In 3rd grade 25% were proficient, 4th grade 32% were proficient, and 5th grade 39% were proficient. Many of these scores were due to students entering a grade already below level which impacted their on grade-level performance and showed a need for acceleration to close the existing achievement gap.

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

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

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

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

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of grades K-2 students scoring proficient, will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of grades 3-5 students scoring proficient, whish is a level 3 or higher will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the 2023 ELA state 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 progress will be monitored monthly and quarterly through formative and teacher made assessments and observations. After analyzing monthly data, teachers will implement conferencing with students to set individualized goals and utilize collaborative planning with peers.

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

Delgado, Timothy, timothy.delgado@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?

We will implement structured planning groups with ELA teams weekly led by our ELA coach within all grade levels. We will look at spotlight and unit checkpoints along with guided text set questions to use as a basis for backward planning. We will incorporate the use of graphic organizers to hold students accountable and allow ownership of work, student led questioning techniques around the room in many different forms, and engaging strategies to hold students attention and maintain focus.

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?

Aligning instruction with backward planning method teachers will be able to guide instruction with best practices to help students maintain progress on assessments. Teachers will use assessments to analyze data monthly to monitor scores.

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
The Reading coach will facilitate planning sessions with all grade levels incorporating prompting questions that illicit teacher discussion and plans that meet consistent expectations and high quality instruction. Teachers will review assessments and participate in backwards planning methods.	Bikowski, Stephanie, stephanie.bikowski@hcps.net
Administration, District content support, Reading consultant and Reading coach will conduct walkthroughs to collect evidence for look fors; progress monitoring, conferencing, rigorous instruction, engagement, and differentiation and provide constructive feedback.	Delgado, Timothy, timothy.delgado@hcps.net
Professional Development will be offered in ESE training to support learners, differentiation in instruction to best meet students individualized needs and active engagement techniques.	Delgado, Timothy, timothy.delgado@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.

We are a gold model school in implementing positive behavior through PBIS, creating a positive school culture with norms and expectations resulting in a safe and nurtured learning environment. Active PTA is

focused on staff morale to maintain a positive culture through providing food, etc. Instructional and Non Instructional employee of the month and perfect attendance certificates.

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

Stakeholders role in promoting a positive school culture are led by our school guidance counselor, classroom teachers, and other school personnel.