

Lake Wales Charter Schools

Hillcrest Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Hillcrest Elementary School

1051 STATE ROAD 60 E, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://lwcharterschools.com/hillcrest>

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2022

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* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2020-21: B (42%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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

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

Hillcrest Elementary School

1051 STATE ROAD 60 E, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://lwcharterschools.com/hillcrest>

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	Yes	52%

School Grades History

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

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.

Hillcrest Hawks will learn, create, communicate, cooperate, explore and soar to their highest potential. Hawks will leave the nest seeking the adventure of life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hillcrest Elementary will strive to build a culture where students feel loved while acquiring a passion for learning. Hawks will soar as they discover their individuality while achieving their dreams and goals, excelling beyond their 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
Thomas, Rebecca	Principal	
Barnhardt, April	Assistant Principal	
Goodman, Nicole	Other	
Camann, Lisa	Instructional Coach	K-2 Reading Support
Powell, Anna	Instructional Coach	K-2 Math support
Comeaux, Leslie	Instructional Coach	3-5 Math Support
Stegman, Tina	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Downes, Laura	Attendance/Social Work	
Bearden, Kimberly	Instructional Technology	
Lochrane, Kimberly	Reading Coach	
Brantley, Mary Ann	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/24/2022, Rebecca Thomas

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

681

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

6

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	126	135	112	104	122	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	713
Attendance below 90 percent	42	45	25	24	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	2	3	3	5	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	25	12	14	21	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Course failure in Math	18	2	10	15	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	8	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	25	12	14	19	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	2	3	3	5	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	16	30	31	35	31	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/13/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	57%		56%	57%			56%		57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%			44%			56%		58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%			35%			42%		53%
Math Achievement	68%		50%	60%			68%		63%
Math Learning Gains	69%			37%			62%		62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%			21%			40%		51%
Science Achievement	39%		59%	37%			53%		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	50%			58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%			58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%			56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

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	61%			62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%			64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%			60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%			53%	-1%
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	32	42	31	61	70	46	8				
ELL	33	43	30	72	68						
BLK	46	58	47	58	69	63	4				
HSP	51	55	57	64	72	44	41				
MUL	64			57							
WHT	63	61	54	73	67	52	49				
FRL	52	53	50	60	67	53	28				
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	38	7	10	32	14	18	10				
ELL	39	45		48	18						
BLK	44	44		38	13		8				
HSP	52	45		55	31		25				
MUL	73			64							
WHT	63	41		70	50		55				
FRL	49	42	32	52	30	18	21				
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	24	38	18	32	38						
ELL	17	38	33	44	58	36					
BLK	35	49	31	33	40	33	43				
HSP	44	54	44	65	67	39	27				
WHT	70	58	50	82	66	45	67				
FRL	47	54	41	60	57	36	43				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	51
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	49
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	56
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	60
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?

We are seeing our learning gains increase in each grade level, both overall and bottom quartile in ELA. We are also seeing the same learning gain trend in our Mathematics in both overall learning gain and bottom quartile learning gains.

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

We still see a need for improvement in our ELA proficiency and sub-categories of improvement. We are closing the gap in reading deficiency, but still want to make this a priority. We also see a severe need to increase our Science proficiency school wide.

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

Our Science proficiency last year on the FSA was 39% proficiency. We really want our Science scores to mirror our math and reading. We are working on implementing science standards school wide, and looking into purchasing school wide curriculum in the near future. Some new actions we are taking to continue to increase our reading and math is implementing "Academic Coaching" time daily that meets the needs of all students based on their achievement level. We will remediate or accelerate.

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

Our math data showed the most improvement based off of our 2022 FSA data. We also showed an improvement in meeting the needs of our bottom quartile students.

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

Hillcrest implemented Tier 3 instruction with fidelity. We also created mentoring groups for our struggling learners. Our implementation of new school wide curriculum also helped to meet the needs of all learners.

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

For the 2022-2023 school year, we are implementing "Academic Coaching" time which will help to group the students based on their academic needs. So our accelerated group will work on challenging concepts while the lower groups will receive remediation.

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.

We will have monthly grade level meetings to help coach our teachers and give them support in the classrooms

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

We have implemented interventionist and support staff to be able to help teachers meet the needs of all learners. We have also blocked out an uninterrupted time in the schedule for acceleration and remediation in both math and reading.

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 Science

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

After looking at our previous FSA Science data, we see a need of focusing on implementing a school wide curriculum to increase our science proficiency and instruction. Our 5th Grade Science Proficiency was 39% 2021-2022 school year.

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

Our school wide Science goal is 50% of our 5th grade students to score a level 3 or higher.

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

We will progress monitor our students 3 times a year and adjust our instruction for our specific areas of need in Science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Goodman (nicole.goodman@lwcharterschools.com)

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

We will implement standards based instruction in Science. We will also be implementing Boot Camp science curriculum. We will also be implementing hands on science lessons.

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

The resources we are using this year to implement science with fidelity are Boot Camp, Science Coach, Studies Weekly, and Scholastic.

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. Science curriculum and standards will be implemented in every grade level.
2. Hands on activities will be used in the classroom.

Person Responsible

Nicole Goodman (nicole.goodman@lwcharterschools.com)

#2. 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.

Our ELA achievement level for the 2021-2022 school year was 57% proficient. Our goal for the past 2 years was to increase our Reading Proficiency to 60%.

Measurable Outcome:**State the specific measurable**

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

Our goal for proficiency is 60% for 2022-2023.

Monitoring:

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

We will measure and monitor our student progress through iReady and FAST monitoring 3 times a year. Leadership team will complete frequent classroom observation to ensure standards based instruction is implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Lochrane (kimberly.lochrane@lwcharterschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Tier 3 instruction "Academic Coaching" has been implemented to help our lower students close the gap in reading. We are also implementing targeted professional development in every grade level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We want to ensure the new BEST standards are being implemented and the teachers are receiving support with professional development opportunities.

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. Teacher will implement the standards and curriculum with fidelity.
2. Leadership team will observe and monitor progress through classroom observations, data chats, and weekly planning.
3. We will be working with our Tier 3 students 90 minutes a week.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Lochrane (kimberly.lochrane@lwcharterschools.com)

#3. 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.

Our FSA math achievement for the 2021-2022 school year was 68%. Our goal this year to increase our math proficiency to 70%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase our Math proficiency to 70%.

Monitoring:

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

We will be monitoring this through using iReady progress monitoring, diagnostics, and growth checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leslie Comeaux
(leslie.comeaux@lwcharterschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will be implementing standards based small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teaching in small group allows for scaffolding and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

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. Professional development through weekly planning meeting with coach and teachers.
2. We will continuously monitor student data.

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

NA

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

NA

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

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.

Hillcrest implements a school wide Positive Behavior system focusing on the Growth Mindset. We are also using Harmony Social Emotional Curriculum on weekly basis. The school will participate in monthly character kick-off that highlight positive behavior. Our social worker and administration will be mentoring students for conflict resolution and character building activities.

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

Our stakeholders include our students, staff, parents, and community members. Community members provide input and support to our staff and students through participation in PTO, SAC, and other outreach programs within our school.

Parents and teachers work together to help ALL students grow! When necessary administration and leadership team are pulled into address any concerns that might impact the positive culture of the school.