Hive Preparatory School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hive Preparatory School

5855 NW 171ST ST, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.hiveprep.org

Demographics

Principal: Carlos Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	7%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (81%) 2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Hive Preparatory School

5855 NW 171ST ST, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.hiveprep.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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	7%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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 HIVE Preparatory School is to collaborate with stakeholders in creating a Highly Inquisitive Versatile Education that will facilitate a student-centered, adaptable learning environment. The School will provide students with a rigorous academic and social preparation that will promote dignity, courtesy, discipline, responsibility, and high expectations in order to achieve high academic standards and become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

HIVE Preparatory School establishes the following goals in achieving its vision:
1. Create a safe, nurturing academic environment where all students will achieve high academic standards and professionals are empowered to embrace accountability.
2. Ensure students are exposed to a broad swath of cultural and academic experiences as preparation for success in a global economy.
3. Furnish adequate resources to achieve the School's mission including the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers and motivated staff.
4. Deliver an instructional system that will be tailored to individual learning styles including; differentiated instructions, active learning, and learning centers.
5. Serve students with disabilities according to their IEP.
6. Provide a flexible and versatile approach that will ensure continuous improvement of all learners.
7. Maintain an effective level of parental involvement.

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
Zequeira, Jennifer	Principal	Support the mission of HIVE. Support instructional goals, support school culture & environment, develop leaders and staff.
Bonilla, Sergio	Assistant Principal	Support the school principal's duties and responsibilities. Directly support instruction and teacher development.
Gonzalez, Carlos	Principal	Principal Coach: support the school administration in attaining HIVE's mission. Provide guidance to instructional and non-instructional staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2009, Carlos Gonzalez

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.*

25

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.*

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

842

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

6

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	120	110	128	112	64	72	63	80	0	0	0	0	0	749
Attendance below 90 percent	16	11	5	11	5	2	16	4	12	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	4	2	13	10	5	2	11	5	1	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	1	1	3	5	7	6	12	6	1	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	1	1	9	7	1	8	3	2	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	1	1	9	7	2	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	13	10	7	2	11	5	2	0	0	0	0	52

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	3	9	5	2	10	4	2	0	0	0	0	38

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	0	2	5	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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

Friday 9/16/2022

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	117	111	132	133	69	61	65	84	72	0	0	0	0	844
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	4	8	1	1	8	8	3	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	3	3	9	8	11	6	5	13	1	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in Math	0	3	16	8	2	19	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	3	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	7	15	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	9	6	0	3	4	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	29

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	4	3	6	5	2	10	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	47

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	1	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	117	111	132	133	69	61	65	84	72	0	0	0	0	844
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	4	8	1	1	8	8	3	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	3	3	9	8	11	6	5	13	1	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in Math	0	3	16	8	2	19	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	3	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	7	15	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	9	6	0	3	4	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	29

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	4	3	6	5	2	10	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	47

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	1	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	80%	62%	55%				81%	63%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						72%	61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						62%	57%	54%
Math Achievement	84%	51%	42%				88%	67%	62%
Math Learning Gains	85%						81%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	81%						74%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	85%	60%	54%				86%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	98%	68%	59%				93%	80%	78%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	72%	60%	12%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	86%	60%	26%	56%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
06	2022					
	2019	80%	58%	22%	54%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
07	2022					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	52%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
08	2022					
	2019	93%	60%	33%	56%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

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	87%	67%	20%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	89%	69%	20%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	85%	65%	20%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
06	2022					
	2019	84%	58%	26%	55%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
07	2022					
	2019	92%	53%	39%	54%	38%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	40%	32%	46%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	89%	53%	36%	53%	36%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	73%	43%	30%	48%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	100%	68%	32%	67%	33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	92%	73%	19%	71%	21%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	63%	32%	61%	34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	37	48	50	43	70	73	55				
ELL	75	61	48	80	80	75	77	90			
BLK	71	63	53	78	84	85	88	100	100		
HSP	82	70	61	85	84	78	84	97	88		
FRL	80	68	60	82	83	81	81	97	89		
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	34	52	42	46	43	9	33				
ELL	75	61	69	69	53	54	60	93			
BLK	78	66	68	71	58	33	59	95	64		
HSP	82	69	70	74	53	50	68	90	71		
FRL	80	67	70	72	51	44	64	93	68		
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	41	48	53	56	65	50					
ELL	78	72	61	86	84	79	83	100			
BLK	74	71	61	84	74	61	76	87			
HSP	83	71	61	89	83	76	88	94	83		
FRL	80	72	60	86	81	71	85	94	81		

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	79
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	789
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	72
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	80
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	79

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	78
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?

As students progress across grade levels, all assessment categories increase. This is true across all subgroups.

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

SWD ELA scores demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. The ESSA Index for SWD was 53%, which is 20-30 percentage points lower than all other categories. This is also true for ELA proficiency and ELA 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?

The SWD students receive an inclusion approach to support. This support may not be sufficient and needs to be increased in frequency or increased in support services.

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

Mathematics, across the board, increased significantly from 2021 to 2022.

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

The mathematics scores were greatly affected by the closure of schools and option to learn virtually. We re-taught all of the previous year's mathematics within every student's schedule from 2nd grade to 8th grade. We also began small group interventions as early as September.

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

Improve in the effectiveness and efficiency of progress monitoring operations (small groups, individualized curriculum & standards, etc.).

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.

PD's will target the effective small group planning and small group instruction. PD's will also focus on utilizing PM data within the classroom setting.

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

All administrators and coaches will receive training to support the all school-wide PD's and implementations.

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 Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The ESSA index for SWD is 53%. This is 20-30 percentage points lower than all other subgroups.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase the ESSA Index for SWD from 53% to 60%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Specific colony meetings (monthly meetings with a specific focus) will be held for SWD students only. These meetings will focus on instruction, planning, progress monitoring data, and classroom observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Zequeira (jlzequeira@hiveprep.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Focus on teaching in small, interactive groups. Utilizing peer strategies, flexible groups and cooperative learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	This subgroup has received support that is separate from the classroom setting. The goal is to marry both settings to provide consistent support.

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

1. Create student groups per grade level.
2. Identify needs via progress monitoring data.
3. Create/Implement professional development that aligns to specific deficiencies per grade level.
4. Implement small group instruction with SWD groups.
5. Implement colony meetings for support.
6. Continue cycle.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

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

For the 21% of non-proficient students, increase the amount of time spent on specific deficiencies per student within the normal school day. Continue to utilize intervention instructional materials that align with progress monitoring data, but increase the frequency of this instruction through increased centers, increased small group and increased intervention minutes.

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

For the 20% of non-proficient students, increase the amount of time spent on specific deficiencies per student within the normal school day and increase the amount of fluency practice. Continue to utilize intervention instructional materials that align with progress monitoring data as well as readers theater fluency program, but increase the frequency of this instruction through increased centers, increased small group and increased intervention minutes.

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)

Increase reading proficiency of 79% by 5 percentage points to 84% proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase reading proficiency of 80% by 4 percentage points to 84% proficiency.

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.

The school will utilize the State's progress monitoring assessment, the school i-Ready assessment, and the curriculum's weekly assessments to monitor desired outcomes.

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

Zequeira, Jennifer, jlzequeira@hiveprep.com

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?

Progress monitoring data will be used to identify specific deficiencies for each student. Instruction practices and instructional materials will be identified by the classroom teachers and school administrator/coaches. Specific time will be allotted and scheduled within each grade level to ensure of implementation. Each weekly assessment will be used to adjust teaching practices. Each monthly/quarterly assessment will be used to adjust learning groups.

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?

The program described above follows the Florida MTSS and RTI programs. This requires data gathering through universal screening, data-driven decision making, and problem solving teams, and focuses on content standards.

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
Gather universal screening data: reading coach, school admin, and classroom teachers will implement the i-ready and PM1 baseline assessment. This data will organized by grade level, reading teacher, and student group level.	Zequeira, Jennifer, jlzequeira@hiveprep.com
Data Driven Decision Making: school admin, classroom teachers, and instructional coaches meet (via colony meetings) to organize the data and create classroom specific game plans for each student. The game plan will follow the specifically tailored school schedule of small groups, workshops, interventions, and centers.	Bonilla, Sergio, sbonilla@hiveprep.com
Implementation / Problem Solving / Professional Development: the school will implement the program, meet bi-weekly to assess the progress, and assign in-school or district professional development programs that fit the needs of the school.	Zequeira, Jennifer, jlzequeira@hiveprep.com

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.

First, each individual is treated with the same care and attention that she deserves. This includes scheduling, professional support, relationship building, personal support, etc. Second, the school implements character education programs that focus on school culture and character development. The K-5 character program focuses on the HIVE traits and is implemented within the social students curriculum or a specific character program block (High expectations, Inquisitiveness, Versatility, Excellence). The 6-8 program aligns with the Sandy Hook Promise's Start with Hello Program. 6th grade focuses on relationship building. 7th grade focuses on the knowledge of themselves, and 8th grade focuses on their community.

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

School Admin: develops the programs, supports implementation, monitors progress, re-visits needs.
School Counselor: leads the programs in 2nd - 8th grades. Responsible for whole group presentations and classroom teacher support.
Lead Teacher: leads the K-1 program. Responsible for assemblies and classroom programs.
Classroom Teachers: support the implementation of the programs and develop relationships where needed.
Parents-Community: plan & participate in school-wide activities that focus on culture and character.