

Hernando County School District

Chocachatti Elementary School



2019-20 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Chocachatti Elementary School

4135 CALIFORNIA ST, Brooksville, FL 34604

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

Demographics

Principal: Lara Silva

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Chocachatti Elementary School

4135 CALIFORNIA ST, Brooksville, FL 34604

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Silva, Lara	Principal	Instructional and administrative leader for this school;
Katcher, David	Administrative Support	Coordinates and manages all state and district assessments for CES; analyzes all assessment data to share with administration and staff; assists administration with the completion of the School Improvement Plan;
Lawson, Jennifer	School Counselor	Oversees Guidance Department and all MTSS organization for Tiers 2 and 3;
Trowell, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal; assists principal in the administrative duties here at CES; manages all disciplinary infractions, as well.
Koenig, Deborah	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader for Grade 5;
Baroudi, Becky	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader for Kindergarten;
Flaherty, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for the Specials team.
Williams, Kathleen	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for Grade 3.
Siani, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for Grade 1;
Holmlund, Chantel	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader for Grade 2;
Durr, Ghislaine	Teacher, ESE	Team Leader for the ESE/Student Services Department;
Ware, Jody	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader for Grade 4;
	Other	Silvina Doherty - Micro Society Coordinator; oversees the Micro Society magnet program here at CES;

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	124	125	126	124	119	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	736
Attendance below 90 percent	9	7	8	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	6	3	1	3	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/28/2019

Prior Year - 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	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 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	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Prior Year - 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	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	14	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
	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	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	73%	54%	57%	74%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	53%	58%	68%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	53%	60%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	58%	63%	82%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	57%	62%	71%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	48%	51%	67%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	54%	53%	69%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	124 (0)	125 (0)	126 (0)	124 (0)	119 (0)	118 (0)	736 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (6)	7 (7)	8 (6)	5 (4)	2 (6)	7 (4)	38 (33)
One or more suspensions	1 (3)	1 (1)	0 (10)	1 (4)	2 (11)	0 (3)	5 (32)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (2)	0 (8)	0 (3)	0 (4)	0 (3)	0 (2)	0 (22)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (8)	1 (9)	0 (10)	2 (27)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
	2018	78%	62%	16%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	59%	21%	58%	22%
	2018	73%	53%	20%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	64%	52%	12%	56%	8%
	2018	79%	53%	26%	55%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
	2018	86%	67%	19%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	62%	27%	64%	25%
	2018	83%	60%	23%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	79%	54%	25%	60%	19%
	2018	80%	56%	24%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	55%	9%	53%	11%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	20	19	20	20	25	23					

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
BLK	45			55							
HSP	75	56	58	82	81	86	77				
MUL	83	74		80	70		60				
WHT	73	59	45	83	72	58	61				
FRL	63	54	48	73	68	62	56				
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						
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				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Students with Disabilities in both ELA (20% Achievement, 19% made Gains) and Math (20% Achievement, 23% made Gains); relative low numbers of ESE students as compared to other schools within the district, 2/3 ESE teachers were brand new to teaching.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

African American Achievement in ELA declined 14% in 2019 (45%) from 2018 (59%);

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA Lowest 25% achieved 48% proficiency as compared to the State's 53%, for a delta gap of 5%. Two brand new teachers in the ESE department.

Conversely, CES achieved 82% overall Math proficiency as compared to the State's 63% for an alpha gap of 19%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math lowest 25% achieved 62% proficiency compared to 51% in 2018 for a gain of 11%.

Math Lowest 25% Hispanic students was 86% in 2019, up from 33% in 2018 for a gain of 53%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

32 students in Grades 3-5 who earned a Performance Level 1 in ELA and/or Math;
32 students receiving 1 or more suspensions;
22 students with a course failure;

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Raising achievement levels for SWD in all subject areas;
2. Raising achievement in ELA for our lowest 25%-ile students;
3. Increase learning gains for all students in all areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Increase achievement levels for all students in all subject areas.
Rationale	2019 data indicates a decrease of 5% for total ELA, 1% in total Math, 10% in ELA for the lowest 25%-ile, 9% in Learning Gains for total ELA, and 7% for overall Science achievement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

We seek a 4% achievement gains in all subject areas for overall and all sub-groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

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

Evidence-based Strategy

Regular data analysis through Professional Development, individual team data chats, MTSS meetings to include guidance and interventionists, and School-Based Leadership Team meetings; Tier 3 interventions implemented by Interventionists and ESE teachers; currently, 18 staff members who are implementing these interventions are currently seeking Reading Endorsements.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Research used in Reading endorsement courses support these strategies; CES has enjoyed success using these strategies in past years.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-weekly MTSS/Data analysis; 2. Monthly SBLT meetings; 3. Ongoing support by Reading Endorsement-seeking teachers implementing these interventions; 4. Ongoing MTSS support by Interventionists.
Person Responsible	Lara Silva (silva_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase student technology skills using Promethean software.
Rationale	In an age of technology, students continue to be increasingly engaged by the use of technology in learning. Promethean software promotes highly engaged lessons, hands-on learning, and supports their practice and understanding of how to be highly skilled users of technology.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increased student achievement;
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lara Silva (silva_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using technology in the classroom to increase engagement and positively effect student learning and achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Researched-based data indicates a correlation between increased implementation of technology in the classroom to higher engagement levels which positively effect student learning and achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promethean Training (PD) 2. Teachers implementing use of promethean boards within their lesson plans in and instruction. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).