Chiaramonte Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chiaramonte Elementary School

6001 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cassandra Smallen
Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2015

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (46%) 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	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 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

Chiaramonte Elementary School

6001 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[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	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

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.

We will establish, within a safe and stimulating environment, a challenging and motivating curriculum that will develop within all students the desire to work to their fullest potential and become responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chiaramonte will be a school where students, faculty, and staff challenge themselves to perform to the best of their abilities in school, at home, and throughout the community.

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
Opila, Daniel	Principal	
Connell, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	
Smallen, Cassandra	Assistant Principal	
Kirkner, Sandra	Instructional Media	
Torres, Kimberly	School Counselor	
Orlando, Jody	Other	
Jokic, Bojana	Psychologist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/9/2015, Cassandra Smallen

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.*
0

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
27

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (46%) 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	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	55	59	69	60	39	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	5	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	10	19	22	29	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in Math	6	16	7	16	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	3	3	2	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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

Friday 6/19/2020

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	58	59	52	45	55	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	9	8	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	24	26	2	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	18	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	1	4	6	1	4	7	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	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	58	59	52	45	55	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	9	8	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	24	26	2	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	18	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	1	4	6	1	4	7	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	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	57%	52%	57%	56%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	54%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	50%	53%	44%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	54%	63%	59%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	62%	33%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	46%	51%	27%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	50%	53%	49%	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	57%	52%	5%	58%	-1%	
	2018	55%	53%	2%	57%	-2%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%	
	2018	56%	55%	1%	56%	0%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		8%					
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%	
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison		-7%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%	
	2018	67%	55%	12%	62%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%	
	2018	57%	57%	0%	62%	-5%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%	
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	61%	-14%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	52%	-7%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
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	39	39	54	51	48	27	27				
ELL	30										
BLK	59	50		54	50		30				
HSP	59	55	50	57	51	45	52				
MUL	56	31		61	46						
WHT	58	58	60	67	59		48				
FRL	55	50	44	55	50	31	43				
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	28	54	36	33	42	50	54				
ELL	18	50		18	30						
BLK	47	46		47	38	20	20				
HSP	52	58	40	55	56	50	45				
MUL	68	61		68	39		73				
WHT	60	68		66	51		69				
FRL	52	55	33	53	50	36	44				
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	21	25	18	31	25	30					
ELL	15	18		23	18						
BLK	44	58		56	37						
HSP	62	48		56	29		36				
MUL	50	41		67	29						
WHT	59	56		57	33		63				
FRL	46	50	43	53	30	27	39				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	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	
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	49
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	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
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	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	50
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 Learning Gains of students in FSA Reading were 51% (7% decrease) and The Learning gains of of Lowest 25%in FSA Math were 32% (5% decrease). Lack of effective Differentiation strategies could have led to these low scores.

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

Our FSA Reading overall Learning Gains scores dropped 7%. Lack of effective Differentiation strategies, specifically Guided Reading, could have led to these low scores.

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.

5th Grade FSA Math Proficiency was 49% as compared to the State average of 60% We have a comparable score to like schools with the same FRL rate, but much lower than the state avg.

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

The Learning Gains of our Low 25% in FSA Reading were 46% (14% increase). Increased data analysis and planning focused on Lowest 25%. This is still not an acceptable score and we will focus on this area again in 19-20

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

Attendance of student below 90% and Number of students failing courses in Reading or Math (marked BL on the Report card)

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

1. Increasing the % of Learning gains for our Lowest 25% students on FSA Math
2. Increasing the % of Learning gains for our Lowest 25% students on FSA Reading
3. Increasing the % of Learning gains for all 3rd-5th grade students on FSA Math
4. Increasing the % of Learning gains for all 3rd-5th grade students on FSA Reading
5. Increasing the % of FSA Math Proficiency for all 3rd-5th grade students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have consistently shown lack of growth in our Lowest 25% of students for Math. This is not closing the Achievement Gap and can by directed towards two areas in which we will focus. First is improving our Data Analysis strategies to identify specific learners and the areas in which they need improvement. We have analyzed data regularly in the past, but our practice has been in a more general group or class analysis. Also, using the analysis to create small groups during planned Math Instruction that focus on closing gaps either in foundational skills or current content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Chiaramonte will increase our FSA Math Learning Gains from 53% to 60% Chiaramonte will increase our FSA Math Lowest 25% from 32% to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Daniel Opila (daniel.opila@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Scheduled Data Analysis Conferences with Teachers Scheduled Data Analysis and Goal Setting Conferences with students Incorporation of new district Instructional Frameworks that focus on small group instruction in Math
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Digging deeper into data analysis for individual students will provide a clear picture of specific areas of need. These will be addressed during PLC's and scheduled planning sessions with administration and resource teachers. Strategies will be incorporated to readdress these areas at specific times during the school year to build on the skills lacking.

Action Steps to Implement

-Incorporate District instructional Frameworks
-Scheduled Data Analysis Conferences for student progress in class and on diagnostic/formative assessments
-Administration Walk-Throughs focused on Standards based Instruction, Rigorous Content, Student Engagement, and Assessment of student progress

Person Responsible	Daniel Opila (daniel.opila@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will incorporate Differentiated Instruction and district provided Curriculum Frameworks school-wide to meet the needs of all learners. We will adjust out data analysis strategies to focus on individual needs rather than groups.

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.

-Collabarative Decision Making
-Re-institute Steering Committee
-Build stronger PTA, SAC, and Parent Involvement
-Include Stakeholders in SIP, Crisis Management Plan, new Mission/Vision development
-Monthly Staff Incentives for Attendance
-Weekly Staff Recognition Celebrations
-Staff "Caught being Good" program
Inclusion in these areas will ensure all stakeholder voices are included to build a trusting and respectful climate.

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: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00