
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hellen Caro Elementary School

12551 MEADSON RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Amy Roby H

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2019-20 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 (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hellen Caro Elementary School

12551 MEADSON RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	40%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

The mission of Hellen Caro Elementary is to create a learning environment that provides every student with the skills necessary to ensure success for their future education through a partnership among parents, school staff, teachers and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Hellen Caro Elementary School is to create an environment where students want to learn, faculty and staff want to work, and parents want to send their children to school.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moore, Sandra	Principal	Sandra Moore - leads SAC, engages PTA, Data Team, Safety Committee, oversees grade level planning, plans for Professional Development based on needs, and serves as LEA
Whatley, Jennifer	Psychologist	Jennifer Whatley-assess students in Tier III, meets with parents and determines if a student is eligible for any services
McGinnis, Andrea	Other	Andrea McGinnis-serves as the Speech Pathologist and also works with ESE and General Ed. teachers to ensure accommodations are in place for students in Speech and Language
Choron, Denise	School Counselor	Denise Choron-meets with teachers and parents to write Tier II and Tier III, and monitors intervention data to determine if the student is making progress, Coordinates Youth Mentor Program
Bell, Sandra	School Counselor	Saundra Bell--meets with teachers and parents to write Tier II and Tier III, and monitors intervention data to determine if the student is making progress
Duvall, Julie	Assistant Principal	Julie Pearson-serves as LEA, plans with Data Team, monitors and ensures students receive accommodations for testing, attends SAC meetings, coordinates Volunteer Program, leads MTSS Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Amy Roby H

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2019-20 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 (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 .	

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	125	129	141	135	118	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	755
Attendance below 90 percent	5	20	10	8	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	5	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/29/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	125	140	130	115	113	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	738
Attendance below 90 percent	7	11	12	11	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	5	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	6	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	10	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	
Number of students enrolled	125	140	130	115	113	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	738
Attendance below 90 percent	7	11	12	11	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	5	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	6	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	10	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	70%	53%	57%	75%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	58%	59%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	53%	53%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	57%	63%	70%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	60%	62%	59%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	42%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	54%	53%	58%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	2019	73%	56%	17%	58%	15%
	2018	73%	52%	21%	57%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
	2018	78%	51%	27%	56%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	74%	51%	23%	56%	18%
	2018	58%	44%	14%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	55%	-1%	62%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	54%	12%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	58%	16%	64%	10%
	2018	84%	58%	26%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	78%	55%	23%	60%	18%
	2018	68%	52%	16%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	55%	17%	53%	19%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	31	47	43	31	63	68	39				
BLK	43	40	33	48	63	47	47				
HSP	71	63		70	75		60				
MUL	78	60		76	83		86				
WHT	74	64	53	72	75	64	77				
FRL	56	56	49	57	71	58	57				

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	30	37	38	37	50	50	24				
BLK	37	55	40	51	60	50	47				
HSP	71	55		76	75		46				
MUL	78	69		76	97		61				
WHT	74	54	46	75	75	69	76				
FRL	53	51	46	58	69	70	47				

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	40	48	47	35	36	38	17				
ASN	100			90							
BLK	45	23		55	54						
HSP	68	63		70	63		40				
MUL	77	57		74	57		70				
WHT	77	63	56	71	59	43	60				
FRL	68	57	54	58	56	41	53				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	46
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	68
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	77
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 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	68
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 (SWD) performed the lowest in ELA Achievement (31%) and Math Achievement (31%). SWD increased 1% in ELA proficiency; however, SWD declined 6% in Math proficiency. Staff changes in fourth grade is a possible contributing factor. For the 2019-2020 school year, staffing for 4th grade was stronger; however, our January 21, 2020 school grade projection projected lower learning gains. We believe that this testing was not accurate due to over testing. Teachers also received new curriculum for math instruction that they were still learning. Additional practice workbooks were ordered, but arrived later in the year.

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

Black students decreased 15% in ELA Learning Gains. By reviewing our Accelerated Reading Data, we were able to see that the time black students spent reading was less than their other peers. For the 2019-2020 school year, black students time spent on reading increased due to creating a Reading Mentor Program. The Media Specialist and Media Clerk also had a target list of black students who were under performing.

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.

Every component is higher than the state average.

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

Multi-cultural students made a 25% increase in Science Proficiency. Fifth grade teachers utilized SchoolNet data to group students. The students completed standards based science rotations. For the 2019-2020 school year, grant money was utilized to continue this trend. Students received targeted science stations in our Military After-School Program. SchoolNet data showed an additional 25% increase in proficiency when comparing the 2018-2019 school year with the 2019-2020 school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

38 students earned a Level 1 on State Assessments. When comparing the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school year, STAR 360 data for AP2 showed a decrease of 1% of student in the Lowest Quartile on target to make a learning gain. (37% 2018-2019, 36% 2020-2021)

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

1. Black students decreased 15% in ELA Learning Gains
2. Lowest Quartile in Math decreased 9%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Black students decreased 15% in ELA Learning Gains. Reading comprehension directly impacts student learning in all core subjects. Although additional strategies were in place during the 2019-2020 school year, learning gains were still a concern across all subgroups with only 42% of all students projected to make a learning gain in comparison to 43% at the same time in 2018-2019 utilizing STAR 360 ELA data.

Measurable Outcome: The ELA Black Subgroup will improve 5% points when comparing FSA ELA Learning gains increasing from 40% to 45%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, interpreting information presented visually, orally, or quantitatively appears to be a hindrance to reading comprehension. According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom Intervention Practices found on What Works Clearinghouse, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction has a strong positive effect size on student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Select carefully the text to use when beginning to teach a given strategy, Curriculum Team/ELA Reps
2. Show students how to apply the strategies they are learning to different texts, Administrator Walk-throughs
3. Make sure that the text is appropriate for the reading level of students, Media Specialist and Curriculum Team
4. Use a direct and explicit instruction lesson plan for teaching students how to use comprehension strategies, Administrator Walk-throughs and review of lesson plans
5. Provide the appropriate amount of guided practice depending on the difficulty level of the strategies that students are learning, Monitored by General Ed. and ESE teachers as well as the MTSS Team
6. Talk about comprehension strategies while teaching them, Administrator Walk-throughs

These strategies will be utilized after ELA reps provide training. iReady training will continue to assist teachers in individualizing students' learning paths throughout the year. STAR 360 and iReady reports will be utilized to monitor progress. The data from these reports will be used to analyze the ELA Black Subgroup and plan for instruction as needed. Administrators will conduct frequent Walk-throughs to ensure fidelity with the implementation of this strategy. Based on student data, additional professional development will be provided as needed.

Person Responsible Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Lowest Quartile Learning Gains decreased by 9% on the 2019 FSA Math Assessment. STAR 360 Math data from the 2019-2020 school year indicated 44% of the Lowest Quartile were projected to make a learning gain; however, at the same time during the 2018-2019, 68% of the Lowest Quartile were projected to make a learning gain. This area of focus has been chosen to close the achievement gap. At this time, we are not making sufficient progress.

Measurable Outcome: The Math Lowest Quartile will improve 5% points when comparing FSA Math Learning Gains increasing from 57% to 62%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teach Students to Use Visual Representations to Solve Problems

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, operations and algebraic thinking appears to be a hindrance to problem solving. According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 to 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse, providing instruction on the use of visual representations to solve problems has a strong positive effect size on student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Demonstrate for students how to select the appropriate visual representation for the problem they are solving, Administrator Walk-throughs
2. Use think-alouds and discussions to teach students how to represent problems visually, Administrator Walk-Throughs

Teachers and Admin will utilize STAR360 and iReady data throughout the year. Teachers will set target goals and assign individualized lessons in iReady

Person Responsible: Sandra Moore (smoore@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Students with disabilities (SWD) performed the lowest in ELA Achievement (31%) and Math Achievement (31%). SWD increased 1% in ELA proficiency; however, SWD declined 6% in Math proficiency. The MTSS team has attended trainings throughout the 2019-2020 school year as well as met numerous times to rewrite the BPIE. The MTSS Team and ESE Team met with admin in June 2020 to identify placement and scheduling of all ESE students. Although our students with disabilities performed above the state average, we will still focus on closing the achievement gap.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The social and emotional needs of students are met through counseling and mentoring services. Hellen Caro houses two guidance counselors and one Military Family Liaison counselor. All counselors routinely conduct group and individual sessions. The school guidance counselors provide referral information and other resources to families who present a need. We participate in the "Youth Motivator Mentoring Program". This program provides an adult mentor for students who are referred by their teacher or by parent request. Students will meet with their mentor once a week. Hellen Caro has also adopted the Trevor Romain Resiliency Program which focuses on community and peer connections, positive character, and building confident student leaders.

Programs or Events utilized to build positive relationships with all stakeholders: Teachers, parents, and students also utilize Suite 360 which is provided by our district.

Parents and Guardians may choose from any one of the Escambia County's 80+ private pre-schools and faith based pre-schools. Children who live near a public school may be eligible to attend at that school. Incoming kindergarten students are screened before school begins to determine the readiness of each child coming into our kindergarten program. Kindergarten students also participate in an additional orientation to help familiarize them with the school setting.

Hellen Caro works closely with our feeder middle school, Jim C. Bailey MS, to provide a smoother transition for our students into the middle school environment. 5th graders are introduced to extracurricular programs through flyers and assemblies presented by Jim C. Bailey's staff members.

Hellen Caro provides speech and language services to three and four year old who are identified and staffed in the SLI program.

The MTSS team meets on a weekly basis to review student progress through the MTSS. Team members review screening data and link that data to instructional decisions. They also review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks and those who are at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources/strategies (research based) that are needed to meet the needs of students in MTSS.

Services for English Language Learners (ELL) are provided as required by state law.

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide resources (clothing, food, school supplies, and social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free appropriate education. Hellen Caro uses SAI monies to buy additional classroom teaching supplies and materials.

The school offers non-violence, anti-bullying, and anti-drug programs that incorporate Gulf Coast Kid's House, guest speakers, counseling, and classroom discussion.

Housing programs and Head Start are offered at the district level and are overseen by the Title I District office.

This program is not applicable to our school.

Capturing Kids Hearts Training

Kagan Training

Parent conferences for all grade levels

All Hands on Deck PTA monthly

Open House

Orientation

Volunteers

FOCUS Gradebook

Family ELA, Math, and Science Nights

Business Partners

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.