Hosford Elementary Junior High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hosford Elementary Junior High School

16864 NE SR 65, Hosford, FL 32334

hosfordschool.com

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 6/14/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	61%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Liberty 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

Hosford Elementary Junior High School

16864 NE SR 65, Hosford, FL 32334

hosfordschool.com

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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	9%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Liberty 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.

To develop in every student a sense of PRIDE.
Performance through preparation
Respect
Integrity
Determination
Excellence through effort

Provide the school's vision statement.

Embracing the Past, Empowering the Future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Davis, Stephanie	Principal	
Black, Beckie	School Counselor	
Edwards, Janessa	School Counselor	
Sewell, Desirae	Teacher, K-12	
Mansell, Alice	Teacher, K-12	
Vickers, Cassie	Teacher, K-12	
Ellis, Miranda	Teacher, K-12	
Peddie, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/14/2021, Stephanie Davis

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

353

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

6

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

6

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	43	43	27	39	42	33	40	40	46	0	0	0	0	353
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	2	4	11	5	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	3	13	14	1	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	12	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	1	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/25/2022

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	43	30	40	40	32	40	42	44	56	0	0	0	0	367
Attendance below 90 percent	3	11	16	13	13	14	12	19	29	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	5	9	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	11	16	8	5	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	5	9	0	0	0	0	28

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	3	1	0	2	2	5	9	4	8	0	0	0	0	34

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	9	1	2	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	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	43	30	40	40	32	40	42	44	56	0	0	0	0	367
Attendance below 90 percent	3	11	16	13	13	14	12	19	29	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	5	9	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	11	16	8	5	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	5	9	0	0	0	0	28

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	3	1	0	2	2	5	9	4	8	0	0	0	0	34

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	9	1	2	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	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	52%	51%	55%				60%	62%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						58%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						49%	51%	54%
Math Achievement	57%	48%	42%				58%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains	57%						59%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						48%	43%	52%
Science Achievement	49%	58%	54%				46%	51%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	56%	59%				72%	75%	78%

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	71%	66%	5%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	77%	64%	13%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	51%	-11%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
06	2022					
	2019	58%	52%	6%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	52%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2022					
	2019	67%	68%	-1%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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	55%	65%	-10%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	48%	7%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	42%	39%	3%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2022					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	55%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
07	2022					
	2019	78%	65%	13%	54%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	11%	-11%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	48%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	73%	74%	-1%	71%	2%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	62%	2%	61%	3%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	28	48	60	38	44	38	36				
WHT	51	54	54	57	58	49	51	64	77		
FRL	45	54	68	43	48	41	51	64	54		
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	33	33	25	43	67	58					
WHT	57	55	37	61	70	47	48	74	90		
FRL	45	46	29	46	67	50	33	50			
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	37	58	50	33	57	60	21				
WHT	61	60	49	62	61	46	48	73	78		
FRL	55	56	46	54	60	50	41	69	77		

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

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	57
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	52
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?

Current 4th and 7th grades below the state average in ELA
Current 4th/5th/6th/7th grades below the state average in math
28% of SWDs showed proficiency in ELA
38% of SWDs showed proficiency in math

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

Summative assessments, progress monitoring data indicate that 4th and 7th grades for ELA and 4th/5th/6th/7th grades for math demonstrate the greatest needs for improvement.

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

Contributing Factors:
Consecutive years of disruption to the learning environment (Hurricane Michael and pandemic)
Attendance

Lack of consistent, intensive interventions for struggling students

Actions for Improvement:
Increase communication with chronically absent students
Small group instruction for targeted support
Target attendance
Conference with teachers
Data review to ensure students are responding to interventions
Data chats with teachers to ensure progress monitoring data is used to drive instruction

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

4th grade ELA and math
7th grade math

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

High performing teachers who used data to drive instruction in ELA and math
Literacy Team
Data reviews after each progress monitoring

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

Communicate and set goals with students through data chats
Data Nights with families
Regional reading support
Use progress monitoring data to identify students needing intensive interventions
More frequent progress monitoring for students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 interventions and be responsive to interventions/change strategies as needed
Encourage participation in the 21st CCLC after-school program for additional instruction/support
Master schedule provides time for additional interventions for targeted students and acceleration for students at or above proficiency
Interventionist support in K-3

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.

Curriculum alignment with continued focus on pacing guides
Professional development for math BEST standards
New core math curriculum for all grades
New core ELA curriculum for MS
Small group instruction professional development
Targeted support for interpreting progress monitoring data to drive instruction
Professional development provided by FIN - focus on being responsive to the needs of SWDs

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

Monthly literacy meetings
Data chats at district, school, teacher, student levels
Progress monitoring
Professional development

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 ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Current 4th and 7th grades scored 38% proficiency on state assessment. Current 5th, 6th, and 8th grades are at state average. Increasing the percentage of students making learning gains helps close achievement gaps.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	4th and 7th grade students will increase proficiency on the ELA state assessment by 10%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Classroom observations Data chats 3 times per year Strategic coaching of targeted teachers to improve practice Monitor implementation of scope and sequence.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Davis (stephanie.davis@lcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	ELA teachers will participate in curriculum alignment with on-going support. Targeted small group instruction with experienced teachers in both ELA and intensive reading classes will occur. Teachers will implement and monitor evidence based instruction (i.e. iReady, adopted curriculum, Ready Toolkit, etc). Classroom teachers will collaborate/coordinate services with support staff. Implement core curriculum with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Curriculum and technology programs implemented with fidelity have been shown to correlate directly with improved standardized test performance. Consistent implementation and on-going progress monitoring are key for closing achievement gaps.

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.

1. Identify struggling students
2. Group targeted students and place in small groups/intensive classes
3. Collect intervention materials
4. Teach and progress monitor
5. Reevaluate, reteach, and revise strategies
6. Coaching of targeted instructional staff.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Davis (stephanie.davis@lcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Current 4th/5th/6th grades scored significantly below proficiency on state assessment. Increasing the percentage of students making learning gains helps close achievement gaps.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	4th - 7th grade students will increase proficiency on math state assessment by 10%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Classroom observations Data chats three times per year Small group instruction Coaching and mentoring of math instructional staff
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Davis (stephanie.davis@lcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Targeted small group instruction with experienced teachers will be occurring. Teachers will implement and monitor evidence based instruction (i.e. iReady, adopted curriculum, Ready Toolkit, etc). These programs have been shown to correlate with standardized test performance. Classroom teachers will collaborate/ coordinate services with support staff like instructional coach and inclusion teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Curriculum and technology programs implemented with fidelity have been shown to correlate directly with improved standardized test performance. Consistent implementation and on-going progress monitoring are key for closing achievement gaps.

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.

1. Identify struggling students
2. Group targeted students and place in small groups/intensive classes
3. Collect intervention materials
4. Teach and progress monitor
5. Reevaluate, reteach, and revise strategies
6. Coaching and support for targeted teachers

Person Responsible   Stephanie Davis (stephanie.davis@lcsb.org)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to School wide Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	School attendance is imperative for all students. Students must be in school to get the best education. 14% of current students with attendance below 90% for the 2021-2022 school year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	95% of students will attend at least 90% of the school year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student attendance will be reviewed daily utilizing FOCUS daily attendance. Attempts to contact parents of absent students will be made daily. Students who are sick will be encouraged to use on-site PanCare. If excessive absences occur, a parent conference will be held.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Davis (stephanie.davis@lcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Quarterly rewards for attendance, truancy court will be enforced for single class attendance not just by the day, letters will be sent when a student has 3 unexcused absences in 30 days and 10 unexcused absences in 90 days, conference with parents when student has 4 unexcused absences in 30 days and 12 unexcused absences in 90 days. Parent Square communication promoting attendance and the correlation to student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research shows a correlation between attendance and student achievement.

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

1. Review student attendance daily
2. Contact parents of absent students
3. Encourage families to use on-site PanCare
4. Hold Child Study Team meetings for chronically absent students
5. Refer to truancy court if absences continue
6. implement incentive program to encourage attendance
7. Messaging campaign through ParentSquare

Person Responsible	Stephanie Davis (stephanie.davis@lcsb.org)

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

The area of focus will be small group instruction. Small group instruction will allow for teachers to provide targeted support to help improve reading achievement. This area of focus is based on 2022 beginning of the year STAR data for kindergarten and 2021-2022 end of year STAR data for 1st and 2nd graders. 44% of current kindergartners, 32% of current 1st graders, and 28% if current 2nd graders were not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

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

The area of focus will be small group instruction. Small group instruction will allow for teachers to provide targeted support to help improve reading achievement. This area of focus is based on 2021-2022 end of year FSA ELA data. 62% of current 3rd graders, 39% if current 4th graders, and 39% of current 5th graders did not score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized 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)

Measurable Outcomes:
70% of Kindergarteners will be on track to score a Level 3 or above
80% of 1st graders will be on track to score a Level 3 or above
80% of 2nd graders will be on track to score a Level 3 or above

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

62% of current 3rd graders did not score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. The goal is that at least 60% of current 3rd graders will score a Level 3 or above.
61% of current 6th graders did not score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. The goal is that at least 60% of current 6th graders will score a Level 3 or above.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Classroom observations
Data chats 3 times per year
Strategic coaching of targeted teachers to improve practice
Monitor implementation of scope and sequence

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

Davis, Stephanie , stephanie.davis@lcsb.org

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?

ELA teachers will participate in curriculum alignment with on-going support. Targeted small group instruction with experienced teachers in both ELA and intensive reading classes will occur. Teachers will implement and monitor evidence-based instruction (i.e. iReady, STAR, Wonders, Sound Sensible, SPIRE, REWARDS, FCRR). These programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and the BEST ELA Standards. Classroom teachers will collaborate/coordinate services with support staff. Implement core curriculum with fidelity.

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?

Curriculum and technology programs implemented with fidelity have been shown to correlate directly with improved standardized test performance. Consistent implementation and on-going progress monitoring are key for closing achievement gaps. The practices/programs address the identified need and have a proven record of effectiveness for the target population.

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
Data Review Literacy Leadership will review reading data after every progress monitoring window. FAST, STAR, and iReady assessment data will be used. Assessment data will also be reviewed with teachers to group targeted students and place in small groups/intensive classes. Professional learning opportunities will be provided with intervention programs and core curriculum.	Davis, Stephanie , stephanie.davis@lcsb.org
Reading Interventionist Reading Interventionist (RI) will play an active role in Literacy Leadership. RI will provide literacy support and coaching in kindergarten through 3rd grade. Assessment data will be reviewed to determine where targeted support is needed. Professional learning opportunities will be provided with intervention programs and core curriculum.	Davis, Stephanie , stephanie.davis@lcsb.org

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.

A positive school culture and environment is built through open communication between stakeholders. Teachers and staff regularly communicate with families, volunteers, community and board members through newsletters, Parent Square, social media announcements, local newspaper, etc. Stakeholders are encouraged to participate in school activities and are asked to provide feedback in order to increase student achievement and stakeholder involvement.

A positive behavior plan and school-wide expectations have also been established to create a more positive culture and environment. PAWS-itive expectations are posted throughout the school and are taught and modeled during the year. Students are recognized by earning PAWS for their positive behavior. Once they earn ten PAWS, they earn a small reward. Students will also be recognized for exemplary behavior through Panther Shout-Outs.

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

Students: follow school-wide expectations
Teachers/Staff: implement PBS plan and ensure students follow school-wide expectations; participate in problem solving team meetings
Parents: Hold students accountable for following school-wide expectations; participate in problem solving team meetings
Volunteers/Community: provide resources and support for school activities
Board Members: approve policy, ie Code of Conduct, Student Handbook; provide resources and support for school activities