Winding Waters K 8

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Winding Waters K 8

12240 VESPA WAY, Weeki Wachee, FL 34614

https://www.hernandoschools.org/wwk8

Demographics

Principal: Cari O'rourke

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	91%
2019-20 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	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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

Winding Waters K 8

12240 VESPA WAY, Weeki Wachee, FL 34614

https://www.hernandoschools.org/wwk8

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

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.

The School mission is to encourage and support teachers and community leaders to work together in order to develop an inspiring and rigorous learning environment that supports the needs of all children.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School vision is to cultivate an environment for students to reach their maximum potential. Students will be empowered to be risk takers and critical thinkers thereby acquiring the skills and confidence necessary to become lifelong learners and responsible citizens in our global society.

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
Cerro, Janet	Principal	Schedule and facilitate meetings, assure that meetings are productive and include review of current data and next steps.
DeArmas, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Schedule and facilitate meetings, assure that meetings are productive and include review of current data and next steps.
Edwards, Carissa	Teacher, K-12	4th grade teacher. Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Shumate, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
castoria, lisa	Assistant Principal	Schedule and facilitate meetings, assure that meetings are productive and include review of current data and next steps.
Wogan, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Medina, Debbie	Paraprofessional	Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Gleason, Sheryl	Teacher, ESE	Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Michaels, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Attend meetings, bring content/grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Giaccone, Flor	School Counselor	Attend meetings, bring early warning indicator data
Ploskonka, Tracie	Teacher, K-12	Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Miller, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Pagan, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Mathenia, Bethany	Teacher, K-12	Attend meetings, bring grade level data and actively engage in conversation about school wide goals.
Torres, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	grade 3 teacher

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Arnold, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Reading Lead Teacher
Badger, Sandy	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Chair
Brown, Katie	Teacher, K-12	KIndergarten teacher
Macvicar, Jitka	Teacher, K-12	Grade 1 teacher
D'Avanzo, Kate	Teacher, K-12	grade 5 teacher
Santa-Maria, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	
Rooney, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	middle grades teacher
Seeholzer, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Electives Teacher
Hernaiz, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	English/Language Arts department chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/15/2020, Cari O'rourke

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.*

3

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

88

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8

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)	91%
2019-20 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	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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](#).	

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	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

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	124	138	136	164	133	159	174	181	176	0	0	0	0	1385
Attendance below 90 percent	20	16	17	16	19	22	24	26	26	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	3	4	3	1	4	3	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	6	1	5	2	2	25	3	4	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	16	34	58	37	42	0	0	0	0	194

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	9	11	5	8	7	7	19	11	11	0	0	0	0	88

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	2	4	7	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	20

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	124	138	136	164	133	159	174	181	176	0	0	0	0	1385
Attendance below 90 percent	20	16	17	16	19	22	24	26	26	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	3	4	3	1	4	3	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	6	1	5	2	2	25	3	4	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	16	34	58	37	42	0	0	0	0	194

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	9	11	5	8	7	7	19	11	11	0	0	0	0	88

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	2	4	7	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	20

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	52%	70%	61%	57%	64%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	61%	59%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	54%	36%	48%	51%
Math Achievement	59%	70%	62%	62%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%	58%	59%	54%	63%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	58%	52%	41%	60%	50%
Science Achievement	47%	60%	56%	50%	59%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	83%	78%	78%	79%	75%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey									
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**									**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
	(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	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
	2018	55%	62%	-7%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison	10%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	59%	-3%	58%	-2%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison	11%					
Cohort Comparison	1%					
05	2019	50%	52%	-2%	56%	-6%
	2018	54%	53%	1%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	5%					
06	2019	53%	52%	1%	54%	-1%
	2018	51%	53%	-2%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	-1%					
07	2019	46%	53%	-7%	52%	-6%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	51%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					
08	2019	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
	2018	64%	67%	-3%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	62%	-3%	64%	-5%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
	2018	47%	53%	-6%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
07	2019	66%	62%	4%	54%	12%
	2018	46%	63%	-17%	54%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
08	2019	50%	50%	0%	46%	4%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	45%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	55%	-8%	53%	-6%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	46%	54%	-8%	48%	-2%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	75%	-2%	71%	2%
2018	79%	74%	5%	71%	8%
Compare		-6%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%
2018	98%	62%	36%	62%	36%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	21	37	38	31	52	44	33	43			
ELL	21	20		23	36						
BLK	39	50		52	57	50	50				
HSP	51	45	48	55	59	46	44	72			
MUL	43	71		43	47						
WHT	53	48	44	60	59	52	48	77	42		
FRL	47	46	42	54	57	46	46	69	46		
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	13	39	39	24	41	36	15	63			
ELL	38	40		38	50						
BLK	42	59	55	52	70	58	42				
HSP	47	48	40	45	51	36	38	67			
MUL	57	52		64	65		62				
WHT	53	47	43	59	61	47	58	81	56		
FRL	45	42	38	52	56	44	47	73	39		
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	11	35	36	21	41	42	7				
ELL	43	33		40	38						
BLK	48	38		53	59		45				

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
HSP	56	54	43	56	52	42	47	71	15		
MUL	68	65		71	72						
WHT	58	51	35	62	53	41	50	79	39		
FRL	52	49	34	56	50	41	41	73	20		

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	555
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
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	50
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	55
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	51
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	54
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

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.

Science performance in grades 5 & 8 is our lowest performing component. Contributing factors & trends include: teacher efficacy and lack of inspiration due to impending retirement; teachers tend to focus on math & ELA since FSA tests all students in these core areas; Grade 3 teachers concentrate on reading / ELA the most because it is a mandatory retention year; 4th grade teachers tend to focus on writing due to testing; lack of inquiry-based science materials and 3rd and 4th grade students not required to participate in the district's Science Fair Projects in previous years: Middle School Science teacher to student ratio is significantly higher than in elementary which limits time for intervention.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was science @ 9%. The factors that contributed to the decline are listed above.

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.

The ELA Learning Gains (10%) data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The factors that contributed to to this gap include teacher efficacy and a unusually high 7th & 8th grade SWD caseload for ESE Inclusion teacher.

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

Our lowest quartile in both math & ELA showed the most improvement. The new actions that contributed to this include: individual Principal / Teacher Data Chats; fluid walls; accountable talks with staff following diagnostic testing results and walkthroughs; and a high functioning MTSS Team and process.

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

Two potential areas of concern include Middle School attendance and Level 1 performance on statewide assessment.

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

1. ESSA Subgroups / SWD & ELL
2. Instructional practice / commitment to science in grades 3 - 8
3. ELA proficiency and overall learning gains
4. Increase Middle School attendance rates
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have performed under 41% percentile for two years for both SWD & ELL subgroups. SWD are falling behind their peers, many have significant reading deficiencies (SRD) and perform at Level 1 on state testing. ELL student data reveals that more effort is needed to close the comprehension gaps that exists in their learning.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcomes for these subgroups is to exceed 41% proficiency. Data that will support our progress include MTSS progress monitoring; iReady data; and classroom performance for these students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategies include consistent implementation of MTSS interventions; control of the task difficulty by teachers; instructional planning that connects language & content that makes learning relevant and meaningful to these students and pre-teaching content vocabulary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting these strategies include that fact that most of our sub group students are receiving small group interventions within the MTSS Process (Tier 2 & 3) and controlling the task will allow for sequencing from simple to complex, adjustment of workload for successful outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

All students deserve a Pathway to Success therefore our Actions Steps include:
1). School Improvement Goals will be shared with all staff.
2). Subgroup students will be identified with a look at historical data.
3). SBLT members will: consistently review subgroup data with their grade / content level teams and with other SBLT members and administration during meetings.
4). Administration will "look for" planning that includes Pathways for Success for these students as well as the the implementation and use of strategies during walkthroughs.
5). PD will be provided for teachers of ELL students
6). Instructional staff will track progress our subgroup and problem solve next steps if needed.

Person Responsible	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our science proficiency in grades 5 & 8 has decreased and we rank lower in performance compared to the district and state. averages. Improvement in science achievement will lead to increased levels of cognitive skills. Furthermore, inquiry-based instructional practices are designed to engage students in their learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Measurable outcomes include science progress monitoring; Saturday Science Boot Camps (semester 2) and STEAM participation; and successful planning of standards based science instruction that includes formatives assessments that check for understanding.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All students in grades 3 -5 will participate in the Science Fair Projects which will allow them to use graphics to present complex information: effective and consistent instructional planning in science will provide unique learning experiences as well plenty of practice through activities to master the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Exploration of student ideas and exploring new concepts are the rationale for selecting these strategies. By increasing science access to inquiry based activities, students will also further understand the use of the scientific method and grow in their ability to critically think.

Action Steps to Implement

Action steps that will create student Pathways to Success in science include:
1). School Improvement Goals will be shared with all staff.
2). Early release days will focus on Science
3). SBLT members will actively review science instructional expectations with their grade / content level teams
4). Administration will "look for" science planning that includes Pathways for Success well as the the implementation and cognitive complexity during walkthroughs.
5). Several Science Boot Camps will be held in semester 2.
6). Instructional staff will track progress of formatives following science instruction and problem solve next steps if needed.

Person Responsible	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

ELA proficiency and overall learning gains will be addressed through grade level vocabulary acquisition goals and increasing Middle School attendance will be monitored through PBiS.

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.

To build school culture among staff, an Engagement Survey Committee was formed in July 2020 to establish ways on how to improve in areas identified in the survey. The committee is led by three aspiring leaders who are have been assigned grade level clusters of faculty and staff. Next steps include schoolwide goals to address the highest areas of concern (Appreciation, Accountability & Curriculum).

Also, as part of our PBiS program this year, we have launched a buddy system among staff members to grow relationships.

Furthermore, PTO, who is an important stakeholder will support and recognize students for receiving a Positive Recognition Notice from teachers or administration.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.