

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Shaw Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Shaw Elementary School

11311 N 15TH ST, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Garcia

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: F (26%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Shaw Elementary School

11311 N 15TH ST, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</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;">97%</p>

School Grades History

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

Shaw Elementary will provide quality instruction that empowers students to be successful and responsible for their learning both in and out of school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Shaw Elementary will be a learning community dedicated to the success of every student.

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
Garcia, Sarah	Principal	Instructional Leader. Oversees all aspects of instruction, assessment, hiring and recruiting, observation and feedback to teachers and all other aspects of school leadership.
Lonsway, Stacie	Assistant Principal	Support the vision of the principal and serves as an instructional leader. Job includes but not limited to: organizing instructional schedules, calendars, assessments, planning of instruction and assessments, providing ongoing feedback to teachers and all other duties of school leadership.
Cross, Teresa	Reading Coach	Supports collaborative planning weekly and support all teacher with literacy instruction and assessment.
Lyons , Pam	Reading Coach	Supports collaborative planning weekly and support all teacher with literacy instruction and assessment.
Williams, Lori	Math Coach	Supports collaborative planning weekly and support all teacher with math instruction and assessment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Sarah Garcia

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.*

3

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

593

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.

18

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	76	97	74	106	76	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
Attendance below 90 percent	0	53	41	66	27	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
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	70	58	58	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	58	61	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	87	77	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249

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	1	18	17	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	30	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	105	94	85	107	87	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	51	45	43	44	41	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	63	37	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	61	30	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	28	33	43	59	33	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246

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

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

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	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	105	94	85	107	87	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	51	45	43	44	41	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	63	37	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	61	30	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	28	33	43	59	33	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246

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

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

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	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	21%	53%	56%				21%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						40%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						44%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	29%	50%	50%				33%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						60%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						55%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	16%	59%	59%				28%	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	17%	52%	-35%	58%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	20%	55%	-35%	58%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2022					
	2019	20%	54%	-34%	56%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

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	39%	57%	-18%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2022					
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	60%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	22%	51%	-29%	53%	-31%
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	20	43	48	24	49	71	19				
ELL	22	51	40	28	66	59	9				
BLK	14	41	45	22	52	35	15				
HSP	26	52	52	33	66	68	16				
FRL	21	47	49	29	59	59	16				
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	16	29	25	16	29	25	19				
ELL	16	47		23	44		39				
BLK	19	27		22	47		26				
HSP	17	44		22	38		46				
FRL	18	38	40	22	45	39	41				
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	18	42	36	21	65		13				
ELL	16	38	33	35	65	55	22				
BLK	19	34	44	32	56	50	29				
HSP	20	42	41	33	58	56	25				
WHT	18	46		27	77						
FRL	21	40	45	34	60	55	28				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	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	41
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?

Proficiency across all contents and grades is substantially lower than gains in ELA and Math. Students are performing well below the district and state average in reading (21%), math (29%) and science (16%). While students made gains in reading (47%) and math (60%), students are still meet at grade level proficiency as measured by FSA. 2 ESSA subgroups fell below the Federal Index target- SWD (39%) and Black (32%).

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

Reading, Math, and Science 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?

There was a lack of consistent and collaborative planning for teachers. All instructional coaches were used for classroom coverage due to vacancies, which resulted in a lack of support for planning and instruction in reading and math. To address this need, new systems for consistent, collaborative planning sessions would need to be created. Coaches would need to be made available to facilitate these planning sessions, as well as provide ongoing coaching support for teachers,

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

Math gains increased from 45% to 60% and math bottom quartile gains increased from 37% to 57%.

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

Increased progress monitoring through daily formative assessments and monthly math assessments, increase alignment between the standard, target, task. Increase in spiraled content through daily review, small group instruction.

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

Collaborative planning to ensure alignment of planning and instruction with the new BEST standards for grades 3-5 and improved processes for data analysis to identify topics that require re-teaching and differentiated small group 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.

We will implement weekly collaborative planning to continue to focus on benchmark-aligned instruction. During collaborative planning, coaches will support teachers with planning learning targets and tasks that are aligned to the BEST benchmarks. Coaches and teachers will also focus on designing instruction that meets the needs of the students based on data, while maintaining the rigor of the grade level benchmarks and providing students opportunity for academic ownership through collaboration and discussion.

In addition to weekly collaborative planning, we will provide bi-monthly Professional Development aligned to our Instructional Priority and defined observables. This PD will include targeted mini-sessions, weekly coaching cycles, and learning walks. Weekly coaching will allow all teachers to receive feedback focused on a single coaching point utilizing the Growth Tracker tool (provided by EO), which will be aligned to our Instructional Priority and observables.

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

Structures created in the 2022-23 school year focused on weekly collaborative planning, weekly coaching cycles, and data analysis systems will allow us to sustain improvements and strengthen systems in the following year(s), while also building content knowledge around the BEST Benchmarks.

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.

There is a lack of systems and structures that allow collaborative planning to occur in a regular and effective manner. Based on walkthrough and student achievement data, it is evident that there is a need for grade level teams and coaches to meet regularly to plan instruction that is aligned to the benchmarks and fosters increased student ownership.

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

Student Practice: Students meeting at-grade level proficiency will increase to 41% in reading, math and science by May 2023 (currently at 21% in reading, 29% in math, and 16% in science) as measured by the FAST (& SSA) assessment.
 Teacher Practice: 80% of the Instructional Observables will be present during classroom walkthroughs by May 2023 as measured by the Rigor Walk Rubric..

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

Student data will be reviewed weekly at PLCs and analyzed to impact instruction. Common assessments will be given at least monthly to collect achievement data aligned to standards and teachers will meet in data huddles to share item analysis and action plans to address student learning needs.
 Weekly walkthroughs to collect trend data aligned with our Instructional Priority & Observables will be held using the Rigor Walk rubric. This data will be shared weekly at Leadership Meetings to make adjustments as needed to planning, coaching and support systems.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Collaborative planning will occur weekly for all teachers in grades K-5.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

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

Collaborative planning sessions will be facilitated by content expert instructional coaches and will focus on designing instructional targets and tasks that are aligned to the BEST Benchmarks for reading and math. Planning will be focused on ensuring that the rigor and fidelity of the standard is present in the learning targets and tasks developed. Collaborative planning structures will also include time to address the WHAT (Benchmarks), WHY (purpose for learning) and the HOW (designing tasks that allow for academic ownership, collaboration, discussion, and assessment). This weekly planning will build capacity of planning practices as well as improve content knowledge for all teachers. It will also allow us to develop common assessments to monitor student progress towards benchmark mastery.

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.

Create systems, schedules, and agendas for weekly collaborative planning, and communicate these systems to the faculty so that all stakeholders understand the purpose and structure for collaborative planning,

Person Responsible Stacie Lonsway (stacie.lonsway@hcps.net)

Facilitate collaborative ELA planning weekly to create lesson plans that have targets and tasks aligned to the BEST standards. Ensure that learning targets are aligned to the intent and taxonomy level of the standard as written, as well as develop tasks and formative assessments that are completely aligned to the learning targets.

Person Responsible Teresa Cross (teresa.corss@hcps.net)

Facilitate collaborative Math planning weekly to create lesson plans that have targets and tasks aligned to the BEST standards. Ensure that learning targets are aligned to the intent and taxonomy level of the standard as written, as well as develop tasks and formative assessments that are completely aligned to the learning targets.

Person Responsible Lori Williams (lori/williams@hcps.net)

Monitor weekly collaborative planning sessions to ensure the fidelity of the planning is met. Provide coaches with ongoing feedback related to their facilitation of collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Weekly monitor classroom instruction to ensure that instruction is aligned to the planning outcomes from collaborative planning. Provide teachers with feedback specifically related to target-task alignment and student academic ownership.

Person Responsible Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Weekly monitor classroom instruction using the Instructional priority and observables developed with the School Leadership Team. Use the Rigor Walk diagnostic tool to collect this trend data, and share data collected with both the leadership team and faculty weekly.

Person Responsible Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Develop Professional Development activities that support teacher development of understanding and strategies related to target-task alignment and academic ownership. A calendar of PD offerings should be published each quarter to provide multiple opportunities for professional development of teachers.

Person Responsible Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@hcps.net)

Monitor progress of 2 ESSA subgroups performing below the Federal Index 41%- Black Students and Students with Disabilities and report progress of these students weekly at Leadership Team meetings. If students are showing progress towards benchmarks, ensure these students are receiving 30 minutes of daily interventions to address learning gaps. Follow up on progress in weekly PLCs and Leadership Team meetings and continue to use the Problem Solving process to make instructional decisions based on data for these 2 subgroups.

Person Responsible Stacie Lonsway (stacie.lonsway@hcps.net)

Schedule 1 Parent Event each quarter to allow parents to better understand their child's curriculum, goals, and progress towards their goals. Events can include Literacy Night, Student-led Conference Night, etc. and will be held at varied times to accommodate family schedules. At each event, teachers should provide parents with information on the current learning goals, curriculum and resources, examples of on-level tasks, and examples of their child's progress. Student-led Conference Nights will include student presentation of current learning, progress towards goals, and reflections of their learning.

Person Responsible Sarah Garcia (sarah.garcia@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

Grade level PLCs will meet weekly to monitor ELA progress of students, and plan tiered interventions utilizing the MTSS process. Interventions should be targeted to a specific skill/benchmark, be data-driven (i.e. phonemic awareness, fluency, phonics, etc.), and be differentiated based on the needs of the students.

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

Grade level PLCs will meet weekly to monitor ELA progress of students, and plan tiered interventions utilizing the MTSS process. Interventions should be targeted to a specific skill/benchmark, be data-driven (i.e. comprehension, fluency, phonics, etc.), and be differentiated based on the needs of the students.

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 students in grade K who are reading at grade-level will increase from 45% to 55% by May 2023. The percent of students in grade 1 who are reading at grade-level will increase from 47% to 57% by May 2023. The percent of students in grades 2 who are reading at grade-level will increase from 25% to 50% by May 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of students in grade 3 who are reading at grade-level will increase from 13% to 50% by May 2023. The percent of students in grade 4 who are reading at grade-level will increase from 23% to 50%

by May 2023. The percent of students in grades 5 who are reading at grade-level will increase from 15% to 50% by May 2023.

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.

ELA progress monitoring data will be reviewed weekly at Instructional Leadership Team meetings. If students are not on track to meet their measurable outcomes, the ILT team will use the Problem Solving process to develop strategies and interventions to impact student learning. Coaches and administrators will facilitate weekly PLCs to ensure the fidelity of the MTSS process is successful. Use of both a physical and electronic data wall will allow the ILT team to constantly monitor current data and the RTI Resource teacher will track intervention and progress monitoring data as well to ensure that all students are on track for grade level benchmark mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Garcia, Sarah, sarah.garcia@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?

Small group instruction utilizing Leveled-Literacy Intervention (LLI) resources. Students will receive daily interventions in small groups based on their needs.

The Multi-Tiered System of Support will be used to monitor K-5 student data and provide necessary interventions to any Tier 2 or Tier 3 student based on the identified learning needs on each individual student.

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?

Providing interventions to address critical learning gaps allow students to to close the achievement gap and master prerequisite skills necessary to mastery of grade level benchmarks. Leveled Literacy Intervention has been rated as Strong by Evidence for ESSA (<https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/reading/>)

fountas-pinnell-leveled-literacy-intervention-lli) for students in grades K-2nd. The What Works Clearinghouse rated Leveled Literacy Intervention as having potentially positive effects for Reading Fluency, positive effects for general reading ability, and no discernable effects for Alphabetic

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
Provide an overview of the MTSS process to staff on or by September 13, 2022. Teachers will use current preliminary data to tier all students in Tier 1,2, or 3 and develop a plan for interventions and supports for each tier.	Delgado, Vivian, vivian.delgado@sdhc.k12.fl.us
Teachers will provide immediate and regular interventions for each Tier 3 student identified and document student progress through bi-weekly progress monitoring.	Garcia, Sarah, sarah.garcia@hcps.net
Provide professional development focused on Leveled Literacy Intervention resources and how to best utilize these resources to provide small group interventions to their students.	Delgado, Vivian, vivian.delgado@sdhc.k12.fl.us
The Literacy Coach will meet weekly with teachers to plan small group instruction that meets the various needs of the students. Small group instruction should focus on both pre-requisite skills and grade level benchmarks in order to support students progress towards reading at-grade level.	Cross, Teresa, teresa.corss@hcps.net
Assessments will be given to all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students bi-weekly in order to monitor the progress towards grade level benchmarks. This assessment data will be reviewed bi-weekly at PLCs to determine next steps instructionally for each group of students.	Garcia, Sarah, sarah.garcia@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 revising our PBIS schoolwide systems for the 2022-23 school year. We have developed a PBIS committee that includes teachers, student service team members and administration. This team will be presenting the staff with a revised PBIS schoolwide plan to include the following: schoolwide expectations, minor vs. major incidents, discipline processes, behavior coding system, and electronic PBIS point system. Students will be able to earn points for following school and classroom expectations and use points to purchase items and events.

Furthermore, we are adopting the 7 Mindsets SEL curriculum, a CASEL- approved curriculum. The 7 Mindsets are designed to promote self-awareness, self management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making.

Daily morning meetings in each classroom will allow time for direct instruction on SEL. Monthly SEL surveys will be administered to assess school culture, and this data will be shared with the staff. Any areas that are not progressing will be addressed by the Student Services Team. The Student Service Team will also identify Tier 2 and Tier 3 students who need additional small group support. Second Step (CASEL approved) curriculum will be used as an additional resource for direction instruction on social skills. Supplemental programs and initiatives such as Start with Hello, Act Now YMHFA presentations, and anti-bullying programs will also be used throughout the year to address specific areas of concern based on student and teacher survey data from the 21-22 school year.

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

Our Student Services Team includes the following members:

Lathania Richards, Counselor
 Bryan Noll, Social Worker
 Kayla Glover, Behavior Resource Teacher
 Kristen Brown, ESE Specialist
 Vivian Delgado, RTI Resource Teacher
 Jorrell Brinkley, Psychologist

This team will continue to support SEL curriculum program implementation as well as our schoolwide PBIS systems. They will review culture data regularly (survey data, behavior data) to track the success of these programs and strategies, and problem solve around any data that is not showing adequate progress.

Teachers also have a large part in promoting a positive school culture as they will implementing the PBIS systems each day, facilitating morning meetings, teaching SEL curriculum, and fostering positive relationships among students and staff.

Parents and students also have a role in promoting a positive school culture. Regular attendance,

adherence to schoolwide policies and procedures, and communication with the school and staff are critical to the success of our school culture. Students will have a voice in promoting positive school culture through monthly surveys that address SEL and student voice.

Finally, we have community partnerships with the Way Church of Tampa Bay and Grace Family Church. Both of these organizations plan to support our students and families through events such as Back to School Drives, campus beautification, mentors, and donations.