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 Gi (per MSID | | 2017-18 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | B Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | No | | 56% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 35% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
| Grade | Α | А | В | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | eve | L | | | | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 |
|--|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 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 |
|--|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 Grade Component | 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) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | | | | | | |
| 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.

Hernando - 0341 - Chocachatti Elementary School - 2018-19 SIP Chocachatti Elementary School

| ELA | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade | Grade Year | | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | |
| 03 | 2018 | 78% | 62% | 16% | 57% | 21% | |
| | 2017 | 69% | 61% | 8% | 58% | 11% | |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 9% | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 73% | 53% | 20% | 56% | 17% | |
| | 2017 | 82% | 55% | 27% | 56% | 26% | |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 05 2018 | | 79% | 53% | 26% | 55% | 24% | |
| | 2017 | 73% | 54% | 19% | 53% | 20% | |
| Same Grade C | 6% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | -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 C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 83% | 60% | 23% 62% | | 21% | |
| | 2017 | 87% | 66% | 21% | 64% | 23% | |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 05 | 05 2018 | | 56% | 24% | 61% | 19% | |
| | 2017 | 82% | 57% | 25% | 57% | 25% | |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | -7% | | | | | | |

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

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 | | | | | | |

| | | | | 011000011 | | , , | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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:

| A | -4:- | 4 | #1 |
|---------------|------|---------|-------|
| Δ | CTIV | | ш1 |
| $\overline{}$ | | V I L V | π |

Title Students performing in the lowest 25% in Mathematics;

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

Intended Increase the proficiency on 2019 FSA Mathematics of students performing in the lowest

25%-ile in Mathematics by 5%-age points; Outcome

Point

Lara Silva (silva l@hcsb.k12.fl.us) Person

Action Step

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

Description

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

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Consistent reviews of performance on class math assignments; aligning iREADY

Description Mathematics lessons to areas of student need; remediation as needed based on ongoing

student performance data (Tier II/ III, Pow Wow);

Person

Lara Silva (silva l@hcsb.k12.fl.us) Responsible

Hernando - 0341 - Chocachatti Elementary School - 2018-19 SIP Chocachatti Elementary School

| | Part V: Budget |
|--------|----------------|
| Total: | \$54,925.24 |