

Hernando County School District

Chocachatti Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	10

Chocachatti Elementary School

4135 CALIFORNIA ST, Brooksville, FL 34604

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ces>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	B	A*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

Our mission is to provide children with learning experiences that will enable them to become productive members of society, of worth to themselves and others, by encouraging academic growth while developing aesthetic values in the creative and performing arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Center for the Arts and MicroSociety is committed to providing a positive learning environment which integrates the creative abilities of children into the curriculum.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Silva, Lara	Principal
Katcher, David	Administrative Support
Lawson, Jennifer	School Counselor
Trowell, Sarah	Assistant Principal
Durr, Ghislaine	Teacher, K-12
Koenig, Deborah	Teacher, K-12
Siani, Amanda	Teacher, K-12
Baroudi, Becky	Teacher, K-12
Flaherty, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12
Williams, Kathleen	Teacher, K-12
Holmlund, Chantel	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Mrs. Silva, Principal, is Chocachatti's primary instructional leader and strives to build and sustain Chocachatti's mission and vision; shares leadership; leads the school's professional learning communities; uses school, district, and state data to make instructional decisions; monitors curriculum and instruction. Mrs. Silva, along with Ms. Trowell, offer professional and emotional support to teachers and staff. One of Mrs. Silva's primary goals, working in tandem with Chocachatti's Mission and Vision, is to promote, for both students and staff, ideals of high character, trust, honesty, integrity, diligence, resourcefulness, and community.

Ms. Trowell, Assistant Principal, shares many of the duties with Mrs. Silva as well as taking a strong leadership role in the area of monitoring curriculum and instruction; Ms. Trowell also oversees and collaborates with Ms. Lawson, the school guidance counselor, where student discipline issues are

concerned.

Mr. Katcher oversees all areas of standardized assessments and state and local testing, as well as collaborating with teachers to analyze their classroom data and to assist in making changes to classroom instruction, as needed, for struggling or high-performing students. Mr. Katcher also works closely with administration where all issues of data analysis are involved.

Ms. Lawson, Certified School Counselor, oversees the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) in order to assist teachers in identifying struggling students and to assist them in creating and implementing effective interventions in the classroom. In collaboration with administration, Ms. Lawson assists in making student placement decisions based on data and the well-being of the students.

All grade levels have a Team Leader who meets with administration every two weeks to discuss the school's current status and shares in the responsibility of making important decisions. This team discusses all information pertaining to Chocachatti's policies and procedures as well as curricula and events.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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		
Attendance below 90 percent	6	7	6	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	
One or more suspensions	3	1	10	4	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	8	3	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	2	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	

Date this data was collected

Thursday 8/30/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	4	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	1	14	2	14	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	1	4	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	4	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	1	14	2	14	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	1	4	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Math Lowest 25%: No, this is not a trend for this component as evidenced by the following data:
2018: 54% made adequate progress for Lowest 25% in Math
2017: 67% made adequate progress for Lowest 25% in Math
2016: 50% made adequate progress Lowest 25% in Math;

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math Lowest 25% (-13% points);

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

CES surpassed the state averages in all data component areas in 2018, however both ELA Achievement and Math Achievement outscored/surpassed the State average by 21%-age points;

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

ELA Achievement (+3%); Yes, ELA Achievement has continued to trend upward as evidenced by the following data: 2018: 77% achieved P.L. 3+
2017: 74% achieved P.L. 3+
2016: 71% achieved P.L. 3+

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Continued informal and formal feedback to teachers based on observations during classrooms walkthroughs; weekly planning and discussion within grade level teams; data chats with administration and grade level teams to share and discuss trends in student data; professional development focusing on research-based best practices for effective lesson planning and applying these best practices to classroom instruction.

School Data

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	55%	56%	71%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	53%	55%	51%	48%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	51%	48%	36%	40%	46%
Math Achievement	83%	62%	62%	78%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%	53%	59%	68%	58%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	43%	47%	50%	43%	46%
Science Achievement	71%	58%	55%	53%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (6)	7 (5)	6 (4)	4 (3)	6 (3)	4 (6)	33 (27)
One or more suspensions	3 (1)	1 (14)	10 (2)	4 (14)	11 (4)	3 (3)	32 (38)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	8 (4)	3 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	22 (4)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (14)	9 (10)	10 (11)	27 (35)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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
03	2018	78%	62%	16%	57%	21%
	2017	69%	61%	8%	58%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	73%	53%	20%	56%	17%
	2017	82%	55%	27%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2018	79%	53%	26%	55%	24%
	2017	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	86%	67%	19%	62%	24%
	2017	77%	66%	11%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	83%	60%	23%	62%	21%
	2017	87%	66%	21%	64%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2018	80%	56%	24%	61%	19%
	2017	82%	57%	25%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	71%	56%	15%	55%	16%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	33	36	41	53	40					
BLK	59	60		53	70						

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
HSP	74	63	70	81	65	33	74				
MUL	75	78		79	44						
WHT	79	70	53	87	74	65	72				
FRL	67	63	51	76	68	59	66				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	28	58	60	39	58						
BLK	67			58							
HSP	78	77	77	82	82	70	80				
MUL	70	73		87	80						
WHT	74	66	53	82	69	64	66				
FRL	69	65	59	80	71	73	70				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title Students performing in the lowest 25% in Mathematics;

Rationale To increase proficiency of students performing in the lowest 25%-ile in Mathematics;

Intended Outcome Increase the proficiency on 2019 FSA Mathematics of students performing in the lowest 25%-ile in Mathematics by 5%-age points;

Point Person Lara Silva (silva_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description By analyzing student data, teachers will identify specific strengths and needs and focus on these needs; use iREADY Math diagnostic data in order to target need and assign appropriate iREADY Instructional lessons in order to reinforce skills; continue to use progress monitoring/growth monitoring to gauge student progress;

Person Responsible Lara Silva (silva_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Consistent reviews of performance on class math assignments; aligning iREADY Mathematics lessons to areas of student need; remediation as needed based on ongoing student performance data (Tier II/ III, Pow Wow);

Person Responsible Lara Silva (silva_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$54,925.24
--------	-------------