Hiland Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hiland Park Elementary School

2507 E BALDWIN RD, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Fa IR Cloth Ilea

Start Date for this Principal: 6/25/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
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 (46%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

Hiland Park Elementary School

2507 E BALDWIN RD, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

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 PK-5	Yes	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	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Every Child, Every Day!
The mission of Hiland Park Elementary is to develop the whole child by empowering leaders and creating an atmosphere of excellence and happiness.

Each day, our students recite our LEAD Pledge. At Hiland Park Elementary we are:
Learning Together
Empowering Others
Achieving Goals
Discovering Our Potential

Updated Summer 2019

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to prepare lifelong learners to be productive members of society and to own their future. #HPELeads

Updated Summer 2019

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
Faircloth, Ilea	Principal	As principal, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As administrators, it is our responsibility to guide conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and provide shared leadership opportunities.
Pitts, Angela	Other	As a SLP/teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
McNeal, Jaclyn	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Davis, Kristal	Teacher, ESE	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Scola, Gigi	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Breland, Steve	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baggett, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Johnson, Erica	Assistant Principal	As assistant administrator, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As administrators, it is our responsibility to guide conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and provide shared leadership opportunities.
Brown, Timothy	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Mills, Robin	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Torres, Amber	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/25/2020, Fa IR Cloth Ilea

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
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 (46%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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	92	75	62	73	80	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	452
Attendance below 90 percent	10	7	6	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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
Thursday 9/17/2020

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	86	71	77	84	71	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	21	14	16	18	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	1	7	2	1	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	4	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	4	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	8	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	86	71	77	84	71	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	21	14	16	18	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	1	7	2	1	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	4	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	4	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	8	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	43%	55%	57%	49%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	59%	58%	52%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	57%	53%	49%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	56%	63%	42%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	46%	54%	62%	42%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	42%	51%	28%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	53%	53%	38%	44%	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	47%	61%	-14%	58%	-11%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	58%	-15%	58%	-15%
	2018	34%	51%	-17%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	39%	56%	-17%	56%	-17%
	2018	49%	50%	-1%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	63%	-10%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	59%	-11%	64%	-16%
	2018	43%	59%	-16%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					
05	2019	30%	54%	-24%	60%	-30%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-27%					
Cohort Comparison	-13%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	54%	-19%	53%	-18%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
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	24	39		15	32	23	29				
ELL	40			40							
BLK	20	39	67	20	28	38	15				
HSP	50	75		43	58						
MUL	44	36		39	29						
WHT	51	56	53	54	54	27	51				
FRL	41	50	58	42	45	38	36				
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	18	23	22	24	30	19	6				
ELL	9			36							
ASN	60			90							
BLK	27	39	38	35	47	32	21				
HSP	46	24		43	44						
MUL	40	41		48	63						
WHT	51	55	53	59	60	18	60				
FRL	38	43	42	48	51	22	48				

	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	15	42	40	13	31	25	5				
BLK	27	42	43	26	40	23	17				
HSP	65	50		62	53						
MUL	59	79		39	33						
WHT	56	53	52	48	43	38	48				
FRL	42	49	47	37	41	28	30				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	45
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.

Data unchanged from September 2019 as 2019 FSA was not taken. NWEA MAP data will be taken into consideration along with cohort data for current 5th-grade students comparing their academic performance to their 2018 FSA and current MAP.

In looking at our data, students with disabilities performed at 27%. There are several contributing factors such as Hurricane Michael, enrollment decrease resulting in staff changes, and the emotional state of the students and staff. The mobility rate of students is an ongoing concern. We will be monitoring our FTE Survey 2 in October and FTE Survey 4 in February to correctly identify our students included in the denominator for school grade calculations.

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

Data unchanged from September 2019 as 2019 FSA was not taken. NWEA MAP data will be taken into consideration along with cohort data for current 5th-grade students comparing their academic performance to their 2018 FSA and current MAP.

In looking at our data, the largest decrease occurred in math specifically 5th grade down 27% for the grade level and 13% decrease in the cohort. There are several contributing factors such as Hurricane Michael, enrollment decrease resulting in staff changes, and the emotional state of the students and staff. The mobility rate of students is an ongoing concern. We will be monitoring our FTE Survey 2 in October and FTE Survey 4 in February to correctly identify our students included in the denominator for school grade calculations.

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.

Data unchanged from September 2019 as 2019 FSA was not taken. NWEA MAP data will be taken into consideration along with cohort data for current 5th-grade students comparing their academic performance to their 2018 FSA and current MAP.

In looking at our data, the greatest gap compared to the state average was Math Achievement and Math Lowest 25% both at -19 points. There are several contributing factors such as Hurricane Michael, enrollment decrease resulting in staff changes, and the emotional state of the students and staff. The mobility rate of students is an ongoing concern. We will be monitoring our FTE Survey 2 in October and FTE Survey 4 in February to correctly identify our students included in the denominator for school grade calculations.

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

Data unchanged from September 2019 as 2019 FSA was not taken. NWEA MAP data will be taken into consideration along with cohort data for current 5th-grade students comparing their academic performance to their 2018 FSA and current MAP.

ELA Lowest 25% showed the most improvement to 62%. We attribute this to our focus on MTSS by having a strong team of individuals to implement interventions and monitor the data regularly. Our team did a great job of identifying those students. The mobility rate of students is an ongoing concern.

We will be monitoring our FTE Survey 2 in October and FTE Survey 4 in February to correctly identify our students included in the denominator for school grade calculations.

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

Data unchanged from September 2019 as 2019 FSA was not taken. NWEA MAP data will be taken into consideration along with cohort data for current 5th-grade students comparing their academic performance to their 2018 FSA and current MAP.

EWS data indicates a need to focus on our students with disabilities and a continued focus on the lowest 25%. If we stretch our students with disabilities to grade-level standards exposing them to rigorous curriculum then our subgroups and school grade will increase proficiency.

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

1.Identifying and providing grade-level standard instruction to all students (specifically SWDs and lowest 25%) while knowing our students by name and need. For 2020, we are focused on acceleration.
2. Inclusion
3. CWTs. Monthly CWT walks monitoring academics and monthly feedback for behavior.
4. Admin participation in PLCs weekly.
5. Data chats monthly for MTSS/quarterly data chats with progress monitoring data/WIG Wednesday with students. (WIG (Wildly Important Goals: Students identify goals that will help them attribute and improve their classroom goal, which will assist in increasing the grade level goal, and ultimately help the school reach our school-wide goal.)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA/Math Lowest Quartile/Subgroups (SWD, Black, Multiracial) Students

As data indicates, HPE is working to identify students by name and need in order to increase school grade categories for lowest quartile and also address the needs of the following subgroups: SWD, Black, Multiracial. |

Measurable Outcome:	Hiland Park Elementary will increase math lowest quartile from 46 to 62 (16 percentage points) and maintain ELA lowest quartile gains at 62%. Subgroups (SWD, Black, Multiracial) identified within that category will also increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ilea Faircloth (faircim@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will continue to track their own goals using our WIGs (Wildly Important Goals) at the school, grade, and student levels. Teachers will keep track all students using the MTSS Universal Spreadsheet where students will be discussed regularly in PLC meetings and monthly MTSS Leadership meetings. Additionally, teachers will complete Data Chat forms to drive trimester data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to John Hattie author of "Visible Learning", he identified self-reported grades had an effect of 1.33 and feedback had an effect size of .70.

When students have ownership of their own learning they have buy-in and ownership. Feedback to both students and teachers also has a significant impact on outcomes. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. WIGs (School, grade, student) ELA and Math (See Section 2: 1f for the definition of WIG)
2. Teacher tracking students using MTSS Universal Spreadsheet
3. Data Chats each trimester after MAP administration with admin and students.

Person Responsible	Ilea Faircloth (faircim@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Rigorous Instruction (PLCs, Intervention, Feedback, Support)- Learning gains for all As data indicates, HPE is a C with many components being under the desired 62% of points. We will focus on rigorous instruction to increase every category relating to proficiency and learning gains. Additionally this year, we will integrate acceleration into our practice with coaching from TNTP.
Measurable Outcome:	Hiland Park Elementary will increase all components to at least 62% of points possible in order to become an A school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ilea Faircloth (faircim@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs will focus on planning and preparation of BDS Pacing Guides while administration focuses on providing regular feedback and support through strategic coaching and CWTs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie identified feedback had an effect size of .70, teacher clarity .75, formative evaluation .45, and collective teacher efficacy at 1.57. With administration participating in PLCs and providing CWT feedback regularly we look to see increases in rigorous instruction paired with acceleration.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLCs meeting regularly for planning and preparation of BDS Pacing Guides (Admin joining weekly on Tuesday)
2. Strategic intervention for ELA and Math
3. CWT Feedback regularly by admin
4. Support of strategic coaching when identified
5. Consistent support of students with disabilities within the inclusive classroom setting.
6. Teachers have a professional WIG in addition to personal WIG.
7. Coaching of administration by TNTP on acceleration and leadership.

Person Responsible	Ilea Faircloth (faircim@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to behavior	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Behavior (Leader in Me/House System/PBIS Revitalization) As data indicates, the past 3 years Hiland Park has had 1019 referrals (2016), 1026 (2017), and 426 (2018). In 2019, Hiland Park had 179 discipline referrals.
Measurable Outcome:	Hiland Park Elementary will continue to decrease the number of discipline referrals in order to maintain instructional momentum.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leader in Me Core Behavior Program, implementation of Ron Clark House System, and discussing behavior data regularly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Marzano identified rules and procedures had an effect size of .76, disciplinary interventions had an effect size of .91, and teacher-student relationships had an effect of .87.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation and support of Hiland Park's Mental Health Triad team. These 3 individuals will be providing support for behavior and student mental health daily. Use of Masters and Licensed level personnel to support students within the classroom setting and small group where appropriate. Use of Promise Room and Calm Down space are additional layers of support.
2. Leader in Me as core program
3. House System and celebrations
4. Use of morning meeting to support Leader in Me
5. Integration of "Proactive Place" in every classroom (Calm Down Bucket)
6. Implementation of EL program which addresses core values (based on integration in BDS pacing guides.).
7. Monthly meeting of Threat Assessment Team and MTSS Leadership to discuss students with behavioral concerns.

Person Responsible   Erica Johnson (johnsem1@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

See above.

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.

Hiland Park is the epitome of positive school culture and environment. Our mission is to develop the whole child by empowering leaders and creating an atmosphere of excellence and happiness. We do this by addressing the whole child using resources at both the school and district levels. Services available are: on-site school counselor, mental health counselors, a mental health triad team of 3 qualified and/or licensed staff, Telehealth counselors, behavior interventionists, PROMISE paras, and mentors.

Additionally, Hiland Park is a Leader in Me LightHouse school in conjunction with the leadership house system. We strive to teach our students the 7Habits of Highly Effective People.
1 - Be proactive.
2 - Begin with the end in mind.
3 - Put first things first.
4 - Think win-win.
5 - Seek first to understand, then to be understood.
6 - Synergize!
7 - Sharpen the Saw
8- Find your voice

Each student is "sorted" into a leadership house in order to uplift and encourage students across grade levels both vertically and horizontally to lift up one another. The four leadership houses are: Altruismo, Isibindi, Reveur, and Amistad. The leadership houses are partnered with the five Leader in Me Paradigms:
Altruismo- Everyone can be a leader.
Isibindi- Everyone had genius
Reveur- I am empowered to lead my own learning
Amistad- Change starts with me
and all four houses develop the whole person (paradigm 5).

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: behavior	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00