

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary



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

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary

12961 BOGGY CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33579

<http://dawson.mysdhc.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Jesha Womack

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
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: B (55%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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.

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

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary

12961 BOGGY CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33579

<http://dawson.mysdhc.org/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">47%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">61%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Together as a school family, we will foster a collaborative, trusting, and safe learning community to equitably meet the needs of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing HOPE for our future, one child at a time.

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
Womack, Jesha	Principal	Oversees all aspects of the school including curriculum, instruction, student achievement and behavior management. Liaison between families, district and state personnel, faculty and staff. Responsible for facility maintenance, budget, hiring, etc.
Lim, Trinity	Teacher, K-12	SAC co-chair, ILT member, Steering Member, 2nd grade team lead
Molenda, Heather	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-chair, ILT member, Steering member, Kindergarten team lead
Carey, Wendy	Teacher, PreK	HCTA Representative, SAC member

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/29/2022, Jesha Womack

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

934

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

12

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

16

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	148	154	140	166	148	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	904
Attendance below 90 percent	2	46	33	50	30	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	48	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	53	40	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
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	1	0	3	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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 8/28/2022

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	137	144	159	155	139	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	877
Attendance below 90 percent	1	20	25	16	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	21	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	3	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	137	144	159	155	139	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	877
Attendance below 90 percent	1	20	25	16	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	21	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	3	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	54%	53%	56%				50%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%						53%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						54%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	50%	50%				40%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						31%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						34%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	59%	59%				41%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

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	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	57%	-22%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%
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	29	56	42	30	54	56	25				
ELL	32	60	50	36	63	60	18				
ASN	70			100							
BLK	44	53		42	45	50	14				
HSP	46	64	53	42	70	64	30				
MUL	55	73		58	63						
WHT	63	67	36	61	70	55	53				
FRL	42	60	49	40	59	58	24				
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	30	10	7	25	32	36	17				
ELL	26	25		30	40						
ASN	70			100							
BLK	42	47		35	44		41				
HSP	42	31	18	36	40	25	21				
MUL	57			50							
WHT	55	37	17	53	46	36	54				
FRL	37	28	15	38	43	35	33				
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	22	52	63	15	36	50					
ELL	23	41		20	19						
BLK	52	63		36	23		29				
HSP	41	40	20	30	26	25	32				
MUL	54	41		62	41		36				
WHT	54	57	65	42	31	33	51				
FRL	32	46	52	29	30	32	32				

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	57
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
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	55
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	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	58
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?

We have seen an upward trend in our Math scores. We continue to see lower performance among our SWD, ELL, Black, and FRL Subgroups.

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

The area of SWD students showed the lowest performance of measure (29%). Our ELL, Black, and FRL students have also demonstrated persistent low performance.

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

This is the 3rd year that this subgroup (SWD) has performed significantly below the district and school. The actions needed are providing more differentiated instruction to this subgroup in core instruction.

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

In the area of ELA learning gains, the subgroups of SWD & ELL saw an increase of 35 percentage points.

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

This is attributed to an increase in ESE services and ELL students being provided differentiated instruction by adequately trained teachers in both core and small group instruction.

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

Teachers will use the prerequisite and formative assessments to gather data on the specific needs of students and areas of strengths to best plan for acceleration.

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.

Teachers will continue to receive training and coaching in how to PLAN for acceleration in their daily lessons.

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

This year, we have two "Teacher Talent Developers" (TTD) and a Reading Coach. They will coach, model, and plan with teachers to best serve the needs of all students through acceleration.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Dawson SWD is in zone C for ESSA. While we have shown an improvement from 7%, we still only had 42% of SWD make learning gains based on the 2022 FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Dawson will increase the percent of SWD learning gains from 42% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

VE teachers are meeting weekly to look at the specific needs of their struggling learners and are providing target instruction. Our Reading Coach will also discuss learning Progress each month during our MTSS Tuesday to Assess next steps for each grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jesha Womack (jesha.womack@hcps.net)

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

VE rosters are created to allow for tier instruction bases on specific student needs. VE teachers are meeting weekly to look at the needs of their students and to provide target instruction based on those needs. The Reading Coach and TTD's are also addressing needs during data analysis meetings and planning sessions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Support for struggling students has to be prescriptive. We have to fill in the skills and strategies they are missing. Providing small group, direct and explicit instruction daily will help close gaps and fill in unfinished learning.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

While Dawson did not lose any percentage points in Science scores on 2021 SSA, students only scored at 42% proficiency on 2022 SSA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Dawson will increase the percentage of students scoring a 3 or higher achievement level on the SSA from 42% to 62%, for a 20% gain.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the analysis of the Science Baseline and midyear assessments. Data chats will also be held to disaggregate assessments and guide further instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jesha Womack (jesha.womack@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Weekly high quality planning to include the Teacher Talent Developers. During planning teachers will strategically utilize district resources to plan for high quality instruction in Science using best practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

When teachers work together to understand and implement changes in their instruction it is a powerful support, this will help them to properly implement the Science Standards.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

52% of Dawson Second Grade students were not on track for level 3 proficiency based off the final IReady diagnostic of 2022.

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

Dawson 3rd grade students only showed 44% proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment.

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 current amount of prior year 2nd grade students performing on or above grade level was 48%. The goal is increase the number of students at or above grade level from 48% to 55% using the state wide approved assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The current amount of prior year 3rd grade students performing on or above grade level based on the 2022 FSA ELA is 44%. The goal is to increase the number of students that are at or above grade level from 44% to 54% on the state wide 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.

There will be grade level data chats with Reading Coach, Teacher talent Developers, and Administration. Reading Coach will have PLC's to analyze data as well as content planning. Grade level common planning meetings including administration, TTD's, Reading Coach are planned weekly

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Womack, Jesha, jesha.womack@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?

Common planning

Phonics Instructions K-2

Rti/MTSS @ each grade level

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?

Dawson is selecting these practices and programs based on looking at the individual needs of the students. The programs will be facilitated in small group, using direct and explicit instruction.

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
Phonics instruction will be implemented in the K-2 classrooms using the Wonders curriculum and will be monitored by the Literacy Leadership team in weekly planning sessions. The Reading Coach will model lessons as well as provide feedback to teachers during coaching cycles.	Latimore, Tiffany, tiffany.latimore@sdhc.k12.fl.us
Rti/ MTSS will be implemented with fidelity within each grade level. The Academic Leadership Team will given a grade level to monito as an accountability piece. Assessment will be reviewed during data chats with Reading Coach, TTD's and administration.	Youmans, Kimberly, kimberly.youmans@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.

Throughout the school year, the Instructional Leadership Team, School Advisory Council, and PTA will meet regularly to discuss both academic and cultural/environment needs. Specifically, the information gathered from the annual Insight survey and Panorama survey is collected, compared to previous years, and a plan of action is created to sustain our schools strongest areas (respect and rapport, trust, professional autonomy). We have also planned on how to address our areas of growth (understanding of student conduct/needs, school cleanliness, and professional time on task).

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

Administration, ILT, SAC, and PTA work collaboratively with our social emotional team to ensure student success.