

Hardee County Schools

# Hilltop 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>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Hilltop Elementary School

2401 US HIGHWAY 17 N, Wauchula, FL 33873

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/hilltop\_elementary

### Demographics

Principal: Beverly Cornelius

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<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>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<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* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hardee 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](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>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Hilltop Elementary School

2401 US HIGHWAY 17 N, Wauchula, FL 33873

[www.hardee.k12.fl.us/hilltop\\_elementary](http://www.hardee.k12.fl.us/hilltop_elementary)

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hardee 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.

Building learning partnerships with home, school, and community to ensure personal and academic excellence.

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

The vision of Hilltop Elementary School is to create Pride among students and staff by being Positive, Respectful, Independent and Dedicated learners through high Expectations.

### 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
Cornelius, Beverly	Principal	
Douglas, Chad	Dean	
Daane, Kelly	School Counselor	
Buzzard, LeAnne	Teacher, K-12	
Gunnoe, Logan		
Dickey, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Spires, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Edwards, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	
Hinerman, Judy	Reading Coach	
Eriksen, Paige	Teacher, K-12	
Crawford, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Beverly Cornelius

**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.*

**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.*

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

24

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

285

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

4

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

2

**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	39	40	47	55	46	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	11	12	20	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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**

Wednesday 8/24/2022

**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	39	58	52	50	54	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	39	58	52	50	54	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

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

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## 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	46%	54%	56%				61%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						59%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						48%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	73%	45%	50%				87%	71%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%						78%	70%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						56%	61%	51%
Science Achievement	21%	64%	59%				46%	43%	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	66%	59%	7%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	57%	14%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	48%	-10%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

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	84%	69%	15%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	90%	73%	17%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	75%	62%	13%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	42%	3%	53%	-8%
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	28	43		39	57						
ELL	32	45	38	68	78	70	6				
HSP	44	48	35	74	76	74	18				
WHT	60	59		70	71						
FRL	43	47	32	72	76	73	20				
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	27			68							
ELL	45	56	55	73	80		40				
HSP	54	59	50	77	84	80	51				
WHT	62	100		82	90		90				
FRL	52	63	62	78	83		48				
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	46	41		63	53						
ELL	53	50	44	83	75	56	38				
HSP	58	54	42	86	76	57	46				
WHT	77	79		86	86						
FRL	55	50	38	86	76	50	35				

### 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	53
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	65
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?

Reading achievement across grade levels falls behind math in all subgroups.

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

Based off progress monitoring and the FSA ELA assessment, reading is the area with the greatest need for improvement. The bottom quartile students performed the lowest during standardized assessment comparatively to the rest of the intermediate students.

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

The pandemic required that student were on distance learning and missed many of the foundational skills required for strong reading achievement. A strong phonics program which is explicit and direct will be implemented in Kindergarten and continued through each grade level should provide a strong foundation for reading development. An evidence based Language acquisition for ELL students will support reading development.

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

FSA Math showed the most improvement compared to the FSA ELA.

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

Explicit instruction and the fact that math is more concrete for the students to understand were the contributing factors to this improvement. Focused RTi and remediation in math contributed to the improvement.

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

Continuing to focus on grade level content as well as evidence based strategies to bridge the gap between where the student is functioning through RtI to meet the needs of each student. PLC meetings will focus on data and teacher observation to move students through the RtI process.

**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.**

The Imagine Learning trainer will provide professional development in order to provide teachers with a better understanding of the processes involved with the Imagine Learning language acquisition program. HMH Reading and Go Math professional development has been provided for the implementation of these programs.

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

Through data chats, teachers, the literacy coach, and administration will review data to determine the progress of students. iReady is a tool that is used to monitor students progress and professional development is offered continually.

### Areas of Focus

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

:

#### #1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

##### Monitoring:

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

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

##### Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being 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.

##### Action Steps to Implement

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

## RAISE

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

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

29% of our K-3 students were not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

Instructional practices for K-2 students will continue to include Saxon Phonics, HMH Reading aligned with B.E.S.T standards, Imagine Learning for our ELL students, and iReady adaptive lessons in reading.

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

53% of 3rd grade scored below level 3, 48% of 4th grade scored below level 3 and 60% of 5th graders scored below level 3 on the FSA ELA assessment. The bottom quartile students in language arts will be served in Reading Resource and tier 2 and 3 students receive targeted instruction during scheduled RtI blocks according to individual needs identified through current FAST, iReady data. Imagine Learning Language Acquisition will continue to be a focus for our ELL 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)

Increasing the percentage of K-2 students proficiency on FSA ELA from 27% to 35%.

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

Increasing the percentage of K-3 students proficient on FSA ELA from 47% to 53%.

**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.

Iready reports- progress and lessons completed  
Accelerated Reader  
Imagine Learning  
PLC notes for student data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cornelius, Beverly, bcornelius@hardee.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?

Saxon Phonics  
HMH Reading program aligned with B.E.S.T Standards  
iReady Reading  
Accelerated Reading  
Imagine Learning  
90-minute reading block  
Core instruction for all  
Targeted small group instruction  
Modeling and guided practice  
Questioning and feedback  
Independent practice  
Scaffolded instruction



**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?

Saxon Phonics is an explicit and direct program which has proven effective for the instruction of phonics in grades K-2.

HMH Reading is aligned with B.E.S.T. Standards and provides the spiraled instruction necessary of K-5.

iReady Reading is an adaptive program and provides for close monitoring of the reading domains.

The 90-minute reading block provides the structure and environment for core instruction during which strategies and skills are modeled and guided practice provided; questioning and feedback are utilized during core instruction as well as in small group. Students have time for independent practice, scaffolded/targeted instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Weekly/monthly reports will be run for iReady, Accelerated Reading, Imagine Learning, and HMH Reading.	Cornelius, Beverly, bcornelius@hardee.k12.fl.us
Weekly PLC's	Hinerman, Judy, jhinerman@hardee.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coach model/coach evidence based instructional practices	Hinerman, Judy, jhinerman@hardee.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coach model/coach evidence based instructional practices	

## **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.**

Hilltop Elementary is a neighborhood school. Within the neighborhood is a grocery store, church and 2 apartment complexes. Although they are not business partners, they assist HES when the need arises. During Open House and any other school activity, HES provides interpreters for our parents that are not bilingual. Any information that is sent home, school notice, etc. is sent home in English and Spanish. Teachers send weekly newsletters home to parent so they are aware of material the student will be learning that week and uses technology for daily communication.

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

The SAC is an integral part of the school. They are the voice of our parents and serve to keep the school abreast of how the community feels.

The teachers are a daily means of communication with parents and meet the needs of the students