Reinhardt Holm Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Reinhardt Holm Elementary School

6101 LANIER DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Terri Fina L

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Reinhardt Holm Elementary School

6101 LANIER DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

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	77%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Holm Elementary school will promote and enhance learning and highest student achievement through collaborative efforts of all stakeholders and will make a positive difference in the lives of students by preparing them for lifelong learning. We believe an effective rapport between school and home should exist to develop a sense of responsibility toward self, family, school, community, and country.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In a positive, collaborative and student centered learning environment teachers at Reinhardt Holm Elementary will facilitate students who will engage in interactive, rigorous standards based learning.

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
Fina, Terri	Principal	Supervision and evaluation of faculty and staff PD for staff Daily Walk thrus Planning math and ELA Analyzing data Develop master schedule and budget Class placement of students
Fetsco, Shana	Assistant Principal	Daily walk thrus Analyze data Planning ELA and math Evaluations for teachers and staff Transportation Textbooks Discipline
Haupt, Melanie	Administrative Support	Analyze data Class walk thrus Teacher and staff evaluations LEA for IEP's and RTI SAC/Title I binder and documentation
Sweeting, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist Analyze data School wide reading plan and implementation of
Wright, Etter	Teacher, K-12	Third grade teacher Planning for grade level Analyze data
Chandler, Lynette	Teacher, K-12	First grade teacher Planning for grade level Analyze data
Kendall, Julie	Instructional Coach	Analyze data Planning ELA and math PD for staff
Kuhlman, Sabra	Math Coach	Analyze Data Plan math Support grade levels Provide PD
Montminy, Kalyn	Reading Coach	Analyze data Plan ELA

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Support grade levels in area of ELA Provide PD
McNair, Shanaue	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Analyze data Planning ELA and math Daily walk thrus PD for staff Support ELA, science and math coaches

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/31/2022, Terri Fina L

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

442

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

3

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	82	78	67	59	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	17	27	23	23	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	2	2	7	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	3	5	6	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	3	5	6	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	11	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	82	71	50	63	54	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	29	24	23	22	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	15	13	5	8	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
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	7	3	11	14	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	10	9	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	82	71	50	63	54	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	29	24	23	22	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	15	13	5	8	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
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	7	3	11	14	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	10	9	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	32%	51%	56%				41%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						41%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						36%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	46%	50%				36%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	42%						32%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						31%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	52%	59%				27%	54%	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	55%	56%	-1%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	29%	52%	-23%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	30%	51%	-21%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	18%	58%	-40%	64%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	28%	55%	-27%	60%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	26%	55%	-29%	53%	-27%
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	16	28	36	23	52	50	22				
BLK	24	36	50	29	31	40	29				
HSP	55			55							
WHT	47	45		56	76						
FRL	29	41	55	34	38	38	37				

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	20	25		12	25		15				
BLK	38	53	55	33	41	36	56				
HSP	50			50							
MUL	42			8							
WHT	65	30		61	30		92				
FRL	41	44	55	35	37	33	61				
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	21	14	31	29	27	12				
BLK	35	40	31	35	27	21	15				
HSP	36			43							
MUL	38	30		44							
WHT	54	50		38	36		38				
FRL	44	40	41	38	35	37	33				

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	41
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	289
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	56
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	39
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?

ELA scores went down from 45% overall proficiency to 32% overall proficiency. Math was slightly lower from 38% to 36% overall proficiency. Science went down significantly rom 64% to 39% overall proficiency. We continue to have three subgroups that score below the 41%: students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students and African American students. Fourth grade data dropped in both ELA and math from the same group in 3d grade . The drop in scores from 4th to 3d has historically been an issue at Holm.

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

The overall student population scores dropped significantly in ELA from 45% overall proficiency to 32% overall proficiency. Science overall proficiency dropped significantly from 64% to 39%.We also need to continue to address the significant drop from 3d to 4th grade scores in both ELA and math.

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

All new teachers in both 4th and 5th created issues, as well as the lack of consistent support for 5th grade SWD. We had two different ESE teacher hired and they both quit after a brief time with us. We reassigned personnel and revisited the placement of our support staff frequently to ensure we were meeting students needs.
Actions:
Continued professional development and planning with someone on the school based leadership team will address the content knowledge of the new teachers.
At this time all of our ESE support teacher positions are filled. All staff will be trained in UDL and will be monitored.

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

Math overall learning gains went up from 37% to 42% and the lowest 25th percentile went up in math from 33% to 41% making gains. Our ELA lowest 25th percentile went up from 50% to 57% making gains.

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

We revamped how we were grouping students for remediation and reteaching to better serve students needs as well as placing more support staff with groups for reteaching and remediation. We did that for both ELA and math.

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

We held standards based PD during the summer for ELA, math and science to increase teacher subject knowledge to help close achievement gaps. We also will have PD and planning throughout the school year to continue working on teachers knowledge base and to have better systematic explicit instruction during Tier I instruction. Targeted interventions were identified to use during the additional hour of reading instruction that match students learning gaps.

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.

1. PD to continue training teachers on reading series as well as BEST standards for all grade levels.
2. PD in UDL for all teachers and explicit reading instruction for teachers working with struggling students
3. PD for staff on SWD accommodations, instruction and support by FDLRS (Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System)
4. PD for staff on Sonday system, phonics chip kit and other identified intervention programs to use with students who have reading deficits.

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

Weekly planning with someone on the leadership team to ensure appropriate instruction. PD and tracking student data on a regular basis will help determine if/when shifts in instruction are needed. The school based leadership team will meet weekly to analyze data, discuss data and discuss/determine next steps or course corrections.

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.	English Language Arts instruction will be an area of focus for Holm Elementary in 2022-2023. In 2021 schoolwide ELA achievement was at 45% proficiency grades 3 - 5 but dropped to 32% in the 2022 year. Historically in reviewing Holm's data 4th grade ELA data drops compared to 3d grade data. Students with Disabilities (SWD)- 32%, as well as Economically Disadvantaged students- 39% and African American- 34% students score lower than the overall student population. In the 2022 school year these three groups did not score significantly lower than Holm's general population but they did score below the 41% goal we want to achieve. Fourth grade scored significantly lower than the school average as well as where that group scored in third grade.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Overall ELA proficiency in 3 - 5 dropped from 2021 to 2022 at 32%, with 4th scoring the lowest at 25% proficiency. We want to increase proficiency in ELA to at least 50% for each grade level. We also want to increase proficiency with SWD students in all grade levels to at least 41%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Data from core language arts instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups. School administrators will conduct weekly ELA walkthroughs and will review school wide data after any significant assessment. They will monitor the progress of students and share findings with appropriate grade level teachers. The leadership team after reviewing data will discuss adjustments to instruction and/or provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of instruction in both the ELA block and the intervention block. The RTI Coordinator and the MTSS team will meet and analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students and provide recommendations to improve results for students in Tier 2 or Tier 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy	Holm will focus on the following best practices outlined in the Escambia Public Schools K - 12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan during core instruction and additional reading intervention. +Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge (promising evidence) + Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words (strong evidence)

being implemented for this Area of Focus.	+Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies: question generation, visualization, text structure, self-monitoring. (strong evidence) This is defined as intentional mental actions during reading that improves reading comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Comprehension hinders a student when the student lacks the ability to apply decoding strategies, vocabulary and lacks background knowledge. As text increases in complexity from grades K - 3 to grades 4 and 5, students need explicit instruction in reading comprehension strategies such as visualization, questioning, making inferences, and retelling. The historical drop in performance when the cohort takes the grade 4 FSA can be contributed to inconsistency of instruction and also to the increase in text complexity and the rigor of the ELA standards. Embedding instruction in how to use intentional mental actions to improve comprehension will help students navigate the more complicated texts they encounter in grades 4 and 5. The practices selected are based on the recommendations of The What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides: Foundation Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade, and Improving Reading Comprehension In Kindergarten through 3Rd Grade. Fourth and fifth grade students needing intervention in foundational skills and/or comprehension benefit from instruction aligned to the recommendations outlined in these What Works Clearinghouse practice guides for K - 3. These strategies align to the Escambia Public Schools K - 12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

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.

Provide professional development on the following areas: General Education and ESE teachers on use of the ELA instructional materials; reading comprehension strategies; teaching students to decode multi-syllabic words, and B.E.S. T. standards.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

The Literacy Leadership Team will develop a schoolwide independent reading plan.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

Weekly planning with grade level and member of Leadership team. Teachers will be paid their hourly rate to plan beyond the school day. This extra time will be paid for through TSSSR funds.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

Utilize the MTSS team to identify student needs and match them to interventions based on the intervention decision trees. The RTI/MTSS coordinator is being paid for out of ESSR funds.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs during the literacy block and intervention periods, and provide feedback to teachers regarding implementation of planning and fidelity of the intervention.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

The leadership team will analyze data collected from classroom walk-throughs and assessments with particular attention to ESSA subgroup performance and will conduct data chats with students, and design remediation and reteach opportunities.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

Provide a literacy coach to support teachers and increase teacher knowledge. The literacy coach is being paid for out of ESSR funds.

Person Responsible   Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

The leadership team will develop an ELA family night to increase families understanding of the B.E.S.T. standards as well as working to expand families capacity to assist and work with their student in the area of ELA.

Person Responsible   Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

#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.	Increasing math proficiency and learning gains will be an area of focus for Holm Elementary especially in 4th grade. For the 2022 school year 3d grade had 47.6% proficiency and fifth 44% proficiency while 4th had 27.3% proficiency. Students with disabilities scored low in all 3 grades on proficiency 3d - 22.2% , 4th - 16.7% and 5th - 0% proficiency. Our African American students did well over all with proficiency in 3d grade - 43.5%, and 5th - 40% but a drop there in 4th grade as well - 22.9% proficiency. Our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scored as well as the grade level did overall at 47.6% proficiency at 3d grade and 44% proficiency at 5th grade but again 4th was well below what we want at only 27.3% proficiency. Our progress monitoring data showed the same drop in student proficiency in 4th grade that the FSA testing did.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increasing overall math proficiency in grades 3 - 5 to 50% and decrease by 5% the achievement gap between SWD and students without disabilities. Also increasing proficiency in our African American subgroup and economically disadvantaged subgroup at fourth grade.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Math skills will be measured for all students including our subgroups through topic assessments and classroom assessments such as exit tickets.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Providing systematic instruction during intervention to develop student understanding of mathematical ideas and teaching clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language will help students effectively communicate their understanding of math concepts. Using a well-chosen set of concrete and semi-concrete representations will support students' learning of math concepts and procedures. Use of a number line to facilitate the learning of math concepts and procedures will build an understanding of grade level material and prepare students for advanced math. Providing deliberate instruction on word problems will deepen students' math

implemented for this Area of Focus.	understanding and support their capacity to apply mathematical ideas. Holm will focus on the following practices outline in the According to Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades found on What Works Clearinghouse during core math instruction and additional math intervention time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	+Provide students with explicit systematic instruction (strong positive effect) + Teach students precise mathematical language (strong positive effect) +Teach students to use mathematical representation to understand math concepts (strong positive effect) + Teach students to use and understanding number lines (strong positive effect) + Provide students explicit word problem instruction (strong positive effect)

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.

Provide a math coach to support teachers and increase teacher knowledge. The math coach will be paid out of ESSR funds.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

The leadership team along with teachers will review data from state assessments, topic assessments and classroom data. They will meet on a regular basis to review and discuss data, especially data on our subgroups, conduct data chats with students and design remediation and reteach opportunities.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

We will have weekly planning by grade level and subject area with a member of the leadership team. Teachers will be paid their hourly rate for planning that extends beyond the regular school day out of TSSSR funds.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

Professional development will be provided on the following: number lines, math visuals and models, Number Talks, Calendar Math, Using Storytelling for Math problem solving, Mathematical thinking and Reasoning Standards and others as needed.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs during the math block and intervention periods and provide feedback to teachers regarding implementation of planning and fidelity of instruction and of the intervention.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

The leadership team will develop and provide a math family night to increase families understanding of math concepts and to expand their capacity to assist their student in the area of math.

Person Responsible	Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.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

At the end of the 21/22 school year 56% of our kindergarteners at Holm Elementary were not demonstrating proficiency, 23% of our 1st graders were not demonstrating proficiency and 38% of our second graders were not demonstrating proficiency. ELA is an area of Focus for Holm Elementary.

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

From our FSA scores 49% of our third graders did not score proficient, 77% of our 4th graders did not score proficient and 46% of our 5th graders did not score proficient. ELA is an area of Focus for Holm Elementary. Historically three subgroups score lower than the overall student population: students with disabilities, economically disadvantage students and African American students. This past year these three subgroups did not score significantly lower than the overall population but did score lower than the 41% proficiency goal we want to achieve with specifically fourth grade scoring lower than the school average.

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)

In reviewing the end of the year data 1st and 2nd grade did have grade level proficiency over 50% but kindergarten did not. We want to increase proficiency in ELA to 50% in all grade levels.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Holm Elementary dropped in our overall ELA proficiency from 45% in 2021 to 32% in 2022, with 4th scoring the lowest at 25% proficiency. We want to increase proficiency in ELA to 50% in all grade levels. We also want to increase proficiency with SWD students in all grade levels to at least 41%.

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.

Data from core language arts instructional will be collected, analyzed, reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups.
School administrators will conduct weekly ELA walkthroughs and review school wide data after any significant assessment.
They will monitor the progress of students and share findings with appropriate grade level teachers.
The leadership team will discuss adjustments to instruction and/or provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of instruction in both the ELA block and the intervention block after reviewing data.
The RTI coordinator and MTSS team will meet and analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students and provide recommendations to improve results for students in Tier 2 or Tier 3.

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

Fina, Terri, tfina1@ecsdfl.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. §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?

Holm will focus on the following best practices outlined in the Escambia Public Schools K - 12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan during core instruction and additional reading intervention.
+Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge (promising evidence)
+ Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words (strong evidence)
+ Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies: question generation, visualization, text structure, self-monitoring. (strong evidence)
This is defined as intentional mental actions during reading that improves reading comprehension.

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?

Comprehension hinders a student when they lack ability to apply decoding strategies, vocabulary and background knowledge. As text increases in complexity from grades K - 3 to grades 4- 5, students need explicit instruction in reading comprehension strategies such as visualization, questioning, and making inferences. Embedding instruction in how to use intentional mental actions to improve comprehension will help student with complicated texts they will encounter in grades 4 and 5. The practices selected are based on recommendations of The What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Foundation Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3d Grade and Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten through 3d Grade. Fourth and fifth grade students needing intervention in foundational skills and/or comprehension benefit from instruction aligned to recommendations outlined in What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides for K - 3. These strategies align to Escambia Public Schools K - 12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

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
ELA coach will provide professional development on the following areas: General education and ESE teachers on the use of ELA instructional materials; reading comprehension strategies, teaching students to decode multi-syllabic words and B.E.S.T. standards. ELA coach is funded through ESSR funds.	Fina, Terri, tfina1@ecsdfl.us
Weekly planning with grade level and member of Leadership team. Teachers will be paid their hourly rate to plan beyond the school day. This extra time will be paid for through TSSSR funds.	Fina, Terri, tfina1@ecsdfl.us
The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs during the literacy block and intervention periods and provide feedback to teachers regarding implementation of planning and fidelity of the intervention.	Fina, Terri, tfina1@ecsdfl.us
The leadership team will analyze data collected from classroom walk throughs and assessments with particular attention to ESSA subgroups and will conduct data chats with students, and design remediation and reteach opportunities.	Fina, Terri, tfina1@ecsdfl.us

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.

Holm Elementary received Title I, part A funds and is developing a written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) that established our expectations for parents and family engagement. This written plan will be devised in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders and school personnel responsible for implementing the plan. The plan will outline goals, strategies and activities to better communicate with

families and will focus on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students, in particular those most at-risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards. PFEP will be reviewed by the district Title I office and the approved plan will be disseminated to parents and stakeholders. A Family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title I budget will support the PFEP.

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

Holm faculty and staff - Develop and present information to expand parents/guardians understanding and capacity in relation to behavioral and academic standards in the areas of science, math and ELA.
Parent participate in various activities to increase their understanding of standards and increase their capacity to assist their students as well as completing surveys to provided the school with input on what areas parents are interested in.
Community partners including various churches in the area: Assist with manpower in developing activities for families such as putting together our outdoor science materials, copying material for students, mentoring students, and/or tutoring students.