

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cannella Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cannella Elementary School

10707 NIXON RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angela Ventura

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cannella Elementary School

10707 NIXON RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

R3 = Success

Responsibility + Relationships + Respect = Success!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cannella will prepare students for life.

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
Ventura, Angela	Principal	
Trafficante, Alexa	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Angela Ventura

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.*

37

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	66	79	85	91	98	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	515	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	15	15	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
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	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	
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	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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	15	10	13	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	5	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	15	10	13	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	5	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	60%	52%	57%	62%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	55%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	53%	38%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	54%	63%	61%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	62%	67%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	51%	62%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	50%	53%	61%	48%	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	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	54%	12%	62%	4%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
	2018	73%	57%	16%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	14	28	33	20	42	42	28				
ELL	29	49	56	53	60	53	29				
ASN	82	71		100	57						
BLK	76	59		57	44	25	53				
HSP	55	54	45	64	59	46	51				
MUL	67			83							
WHT	56	39		69	69		59				
FRL	58	55	43	64	57	42	51				
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	20	46	47	27	41	39	10				
ELL	40	58	56	58	69	46	25				
ASN	60	82		95	100						
BLK	61	71		59	61		42				
HSP	56	56	45	62	60	49	41				
WHT	70	55		75	68	62	64				
FRL	57	58	44	64	66	55	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
SWD	22	33	33	29	57	58	20				
ELL	49	52	47	58	68	63	63				
ASN	67	62		92	81		64				
BLK	66	43		55	67						
HSP	57	53	40	58	67	61	60				
MUL	75			50							
WHT	68	60		65	64		64				
FRL	56	52	36	57	67	60	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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	57
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	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	58
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	56
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.

The lowest performance was in ELA lowest 25th percentile.

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

The greatest decline was in Math learning gains.

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 greatest gap is ELA lowest 25th percentile.

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

Science Achievement showed the most improvement.

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

Attendance below 90% per student.

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

1. Deliver differentiated small group instruction.
2. Increase student growth through standards-based planning, data analysis and reflection of teaching practices.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Deliver differentiated small group instruction through the use of common assessment data in order to meet students' academic needs.

Measurable Outcome:

Students will demonstrate at least one years worth of growth as measured by the iReady reading and math diagnostic.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Grade level PLCs will meet and reflect on student data and discuss strategies to move students forward.

Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:

Students receiving more direct standards based specific instruction will help increase their level of understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze results of math monthly common assessments, running records, district formative measures. Reflect and plan at PLC and collaborative planning sessions using the assessment tools stated above. Implement instructional practices aligned to students area of need (based on school wide assessment tools).

Person Responsible

Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase student growth in ELA and Math through standards-based planning, data analysis of common assessments, and ongoing reflection of teaching practices.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will show at least a years worth of growth on the iReady reading and math diagnostic.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alexa Trafficante (alex.trafficante@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs and content specific teams will meet to review student data trends and best practices to help drive instruction forward.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reflecting on teaching practices and the data analysis of common assessments teachers can move students forward by identifying instructional gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Through root cause analysis, PLCs and grade level teams will identify instructional gaps aligned to standards. Plan differentiated small groups based on areas of need.

Person Responsible Alexa Trafficante (alex.trafficante@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Deliver differentiated small group instruction through the use of common assessment data in order to meet students' academic needs.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will demonstrate at least one years worth of growth as measured by the iReady reading and math diagnostic.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Grade level PLCs will meet and reflect on student data and discuss strategies to move students forward.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students receiving more direct standards based specific instruction will help increase their level of understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze results of math monthly common assessments, running records, district formative measures, and BrainSpring data.

Reflect and plan at PLC and collaborative planning sessions using the assessment tools stated above. Implement instructional practices aligned to students area of need (based on school wide assessment tools).

Person Responsible Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will consistently collaborate and communicate with all relevant stakeholders.

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.

We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home flyers, making parent link phone calls and posting everything on our website and social media. We focus on communicating every child's progress to families by engaging parents in parent/teacher conferences and sending home quarterly progress notes. School staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. We value building positive relationships with families.

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00