

Seminole County Public Schools

# Layer Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Layer Elementary School

4201 SR 419, Winter Springs, FL 32708

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0121>

## Demographics

**Principal: Cheryl Lindsay**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Layer Elementary School

4201 SR 419, Winter Springs, FL 32708

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0121>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">57%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">60%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	C	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

## 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.**

The Mission of Layer Elementary School is To Build a Community of Confident Problem Solvers and Productive Citizens of Tomorrow.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

One Year's Growth in One Year's Time: Accelerate Beyond Proficiency to Mastery

### 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
Todd, Lindsay	Principal	Instructional Leader, SAC/PTA Administrator, MTSS/SST Facilitator, Facilities, School Budget, HR Components, and Monitor SIP
Wright, Artranise	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Test Coordinator, Professional Development Coordinator, Business Partner/Dividend Coordinator, and Monitor SIP
Borrazzo, Kristi	Instructional Technology	Computer Technology Facilitator, PBIS Facilitator, Media Specialist, and School Communication
Holcomb, Rebecca	Reading Coach	Reading Coach, Monitors Reading data, Facilitates Reading/Writing PLCs, iReady Champion, PD Facilitator, Reading Intervention/MTSS Facilitator
Mahon, Heather	Math Coach	Math Coach, Monitors Math data, Facilitates Math/Science PLCs, iReady Champion, PD Facilitator, Math Intervention/MTSS Facilitator
Akins, Neva	School Counselor	Guidance, Social/Emotional Coordinator, Student Study Coordinator, Attendance/Tuancy, Family and Community Liaison, MTSS Behavior Facilitator

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 7/1/2022, Cheryl Lindsay

**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.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

45

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

563

**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.**

7

**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	71	126	95	89	88	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	2	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7



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	3	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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

Monday 8/15/2022

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	96	90	80	96	75	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	6	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	1	0	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

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

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	2	4	5	9	3	7	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	96	90	80	96	75	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	6	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	1	0	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

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

**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	2	4	5	9	3	7	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	63%	65%	56%				65%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						59%	61%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						45%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	46%	50%				71%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	45%						70%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%						38%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	65%	59%				61%	62%	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	61%	67%	-6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	65%	-1%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

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	64%	71%	-7%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	72%	-1%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	65%	3%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	53%	3%
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	40	46	25	22	38	24	30				
ELL	46	50		62	50						
BLK	35	39		28	24	18	15				
HSP	57	49		43	50	36	39				
MUL	46			38							
WHT	74	66	57	67	45	20	80				
FRL	50	44	29	41	35	20	43				
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	31	25	20	27	5		24				
ELL	47			53							
BLK	29	31		21			17				
HSP	58	40		42	40		58				
MUL	18			18							
WHT	74	54		69	35	10	53				
FRL	47	37	27	38	19		39				
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	25	38	33	43	53	39	24				
ELL	50	52	40	57	52	18	45				
ASN	80			90							
BLK	50	38		65	46						
HSP	60	60	47	59	56	32	48				
MUL	36	70		50	70						
WHT	74	64	46	82	84		69				
FRL	51	53	37	57	61	32	50				

**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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?**

Low performance of Black/African american students, economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities across all state assessment components.

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

Components in need of improvement include ELA and Math low 25 learning gains.

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

Factors contributing to the low performance of Black/African American students, economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Components showing the most improvement include Science achievement, Math learning gains and Math low 25 learning gains.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student learning.

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

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include focus on instructional strategies Sustainability of improvement efforts Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include support of standards based instruction across all content areas, social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

**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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Increasing academic achievement of Black/African American students, economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for Black/African American students, economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lindsay Todd (lindsay\_todd@scps.k12.fl.us)

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

Lessons aligned to B.E.S.T. benchmarks at the appropriate grade level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.

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

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

**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.

Target PLC and PD to the alignment and the implementation of the BEST Standards and the utilization of new resources.

**Person Responsible** Lindsay Todd (lindsay\_todd@scps.k12.fl.us)

Develop student owned data notebooks for the purpose of goal setting/feedback through consistent weekly data chats with teachers and with parents through Student Led Conferences

**Person Responsible** Lindsay Todd (lindsay\_todd@scps.k12.fl.us)

Develop exit slips and formative assessments to monitor the mastery of the standards for ELA and for Math.

**Person Responsible** Lindsay Todd (lindsay\_todd@scps.k12.fl.us)



## 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

Improving Reading/ELA instruction for students in grades K-2. Review of 2021-2022 ELA progress monitoring data reflects the need for improving on grade level ELA performance of K-2 students.

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

Improving Reading/ELA instruction for students in grades 3-5. Review of 2021-2022 FSA ELA results and district progress monitoring data reflects the need for improving on grade level ELA performance of 3-5 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 measurable outcome will be an increase in the percentage of students scoring at grade level or above on the FAST PM 3 and iReady diagnostic assessments.

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The measurable outcome will be an increase in the percentage of students scoring at grade level or above on the FAST PM 3 and iReady diagnostic assessments.

#### 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.

This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA, FAST and iReady outcomes.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Todd, Lindsay, lindsay\_todd@scps.k12.fl.us

#### 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?

Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.

#### 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?

By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention.

**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
Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data.	
Utilizing results of FAST PM1 and PM2, DRA and iReady diagnostics to design reading acceleration support for students.	
Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions.	Todd, Lindsay,
Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction.	lindsay_todd@scps.k12.fl.us
Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block.	
Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.	

**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.**

Our school works to build positive relationships with families and the community. We encourage open communication with families and provide opportunities for students to showcase their competencies during open School events. Some of these events include Student Led Conference Night, Community Involvement Night, Reading Night, Field day, etc. The teachers hold parent teacher conferences within the first 30 days of school to go over the child's Beginning of the Year Data and answer any questions. Teachers provide a variety of scheduling options to meet the needs of the families. Layer is active on social media and uses multiple platforms to highlight the strengths of our school, and school events.

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

Community stakeholders help provide a positive culture within the school setting by making donations to organizations like PTA. These donations help PTA raise money for school projects and other needs. State

College and Universities also promote a positive culture by providing quality interns who help develop a passion for teaching.