

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cimino 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

Cimino Elementary School

4329 CULBREATH RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Joanne Griffiths

Start Date for this Principal: 6/5/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 41% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%) |
| 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 was approved by the Hillsborough County School Board on 9/24/2020.

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

Cimino Elementary School

4329 CULBREATH RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>40%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>43%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hillsborough County School Board on 9/24/2020.

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.

To maximize student potential and provide them with the knowledge, skills and character necessary for college and career success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a top performing school in Hillsborough County.

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 |
|------|-------|---------------------------------|
|------|-------|---------------------------------|

Leadership team meetings can include the following:

- Principal
- Assistant principal
- Guidance Counselor
- SAC Chair/School Psychologist/ Behavior team representative
- School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative
- Academic Coach (reading)
- ESE Teachers
- PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area
- District support staff

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|---|
| Griffiths, Joanne | Principal | The Leadership team meets regularly(bi-weekly/ bi -monthly) The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core(Tier1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2&3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goals in curricular, behavioral and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLC's and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through the Leadership Team Meetings and PLC's. |
|----------------------|-----------|---|

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/5/2017, Joanne Griffiths

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

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 | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 41% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%) |
| 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 | 126 | 124 | 122 | 121 | 122 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 752 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 8 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| 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 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

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 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 69% | 52% | 57% | 72% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 69% | 55% | 58% | 65% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 68% | 50% | 53% | 47% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 68% | 54% | 63% | 68% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 69% | 57% | 62% | 56% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | 46% | 51% | 52% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 67% | 50% | 53% | 69% | 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 | 68% | 52% | 16% | 58% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 53% | 15% | 57% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 69% | 55% | 14% | 58% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 55% | 16% | 56% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 69% | 54% | 15% | 56% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 51% | 15% | 55% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 60% | 54% | 6% | 62% | -2% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 66% | 55% | 11% | 62% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 78% | 57% | 21% | 64% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 80% | 57% | 23% | 62% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 66% | 54% | 12% | 60% | 6% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 54% | 10% | 61% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -14% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 68% | 51% | 17% | 53% | 15% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 52% | 14% | 55% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 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 | 27 | 51 | 52 | 33 | 40 | 32 | 26 | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 40 | | 64 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | 57 | | 47 | 43 | | 61 | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 65 | 61 | 56 | 71 | 46 | 49 | | | | |
| MUL | 68 | 75 | | 76 | 81 | | 82 | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | 71 | 66 | 75 | 69 | 38 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 53 | 67 | 55 | 58 | 41 | 47 | | | | |

| 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 | 39 | 36 | 29 | 36 | 47 | 25 | 62 | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | 73 | | 45 | 64 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 61 | 30 | 53 | 74 | | 55 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 65 | 41 | 66 | 70 | 67 | 65 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | 65 | | 67 | 61 | | 70 | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 51 | 30 | 75 | 68 | 44 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 46 | 29 | 58 | 62 | 45 | 62 | | | | |

| 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 | 46 | 51 | 35 | 46 | 40 | 33 | 43 | | | | |
| ELL | 75 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | 45 | 33 | 51 | 74 | | 58 | | | | |
| HSP | 65 | 59 | 50 | 59 | 50 | 44 | 69 | | | | |
| MUL | 78 | 67 | | 81 | 56 | | 91 | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 68 | 51 | 71 | 56 | 54 | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 53 | 33 | 46 | 53 | 44 | 55 | | | | |

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 | 66 |
| 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 | 531 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 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 | 76 |
| 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 | 67 |
| 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.

Based on Spring 2020 Form 2 and iReady growth data, ELA and Math achievement for students in the bottom quartile significantly decreased; ELA 68% to 41% ELA and Math 41% to 19%. Overall gain scores in ELA decreased by 27% and 49% in Math.

Planning and delivering effective core instruction and providing differentiated interventions to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are contributing factors affecting student performance.

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

The greatest decline in student performance was bottom quartile gains in Math decreasing from 41% to 19%.

The factor that contributed to this decline was using progress monitoring strategies to identify and target intervention strategies.

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 bottom quartile students in math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This has been a trend for the past two years.

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

FSA data from 2018 to 2019 reflected improvement in ELA gains from 56% to 69%. The most significant gains in ELA was demonstrated by our bottom quartile students increasing from 33% to 68%. As a result of focusing on our instructional priority to use assessments to plan for instruction, weekly data analysis planning sessions were scheduled with our Reading Coach for each grade level. Grade level teams worked in Professional Learning Communities to discuss student performance and identify targeted instruction. Monthly PSLT meetings were scheduled to discuss Tier 2 and Tier 3 student performance and interventions.

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

1. Differentiated interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students
2. Increasing bottom quartile gains in ELA and math

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

1. Increasing learning gains in math for the bottom quartile
2. Increasing learning gains in ELA for the bottom quartile
3. Increasing overall learning gains in math
4. Increasing overall learning gains in ELA
5. Planning and collaboration to improve differentiated strategies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data-driven instructional planning aligned with Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) that engages students with an appropriate level of rigor and cognitive complexity.

Measurable Outcome: Student achievement will increase in mathematics for students in the bottom quartile by 10%. Overall mathematics gains will increase for students across all grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based strategies will include weekly standards-focused PLC's, standards based coaching cycles in mathematics, daily small group math instruction and targeted interventions designed to meet individual student needs. Grade level teams will utilize standards-based resources during weekly PLC meetings to strengthen their capacity to plan and deliver effective core instruction. Teachers will improve their progress monitoring strategies by working in collaborative groups to discuss triangulation and interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Professional learning community practices are proven to be effective in building teaching capacity and the academic performance of students. When implemented with fidelity, this strategy will enable teachers to meet regularly, share expertise, and works collaboratively to improve teaching and student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Create master schedule that supports daily common planning time and weekly standards-focused PLCs.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Coaching cycles focused on planning and implementing rigorous standards based instruction will be scheduled regularly.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development will be scheduled monthly to enable teachers to choose from multiple opportunities for training.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Teachers on each grade level team will act as a member of an academic team or problem-solving leadership team.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data-driven instructional planning aligned with Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS) that engages students with an appropriate level of rigor and cognitive complexity.

Measurable Outcome: Student achievement will increase in ELA for students in the bottom quartile by 10%. Overall ELA gains will increase for students across all grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based strategies will include weekly standards-focused PLC's, standards based coaching cycles in ELA, daily small group ELA instruction and targeted interventions designed to meet individual student needs. Grade level teams will utilize standards-based resources during weekly PLC meetings to strengthen their capacity to plan and deliver effective core instruction. Teachers will improve their progress monitoring strategies by working in collaborative groups to discuss triangulation and interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Professional learning community practices are proven to be effective in building teaching capacity and the academic performance of students. When implemented with fidelity, this strategy will enable teachers to meet regularly, share expertise, and works collaboratively to improve teaching and student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Create master schedule that supports daily common planning time and weekly standards-focused PLCs.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Coaching cycles focused on planning and implementing rigorous standards based instruction will be scheduled regularly.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development will be scheduled monthly to enable teachers to choose from multiple opportunities for training.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Teachers on each grade level team will act as a member of an academic team or problem-solving leadership team.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Personalized learning opportunities will be enhanced for students with disabilities to maximize their engagement. SWD's will have multiple means of engagement, representations of content, and ways to express knowledge.

Measurable Outcome: Student achievement will increase in ELA and Math for SWD by 10%. Overall gains will increase for SWD across all grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The research-based strategies that will be implemented include control of task difficulty, using a combination of direct instruction and differentiated strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies provide specific research-based approaches that improve student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify differentiated strategies to teach students at their instructional level, sequence from simple to complex, adjust assignments, provide necessary accommodations.

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Identify and communicate Standards-based Learning Target and Success Criteria

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Small group instruction

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Provide specific, immediate, and positive feedback

Person Responsible Joanne Griffiths (104253@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of each area of focus strategy. In collaboration with the PLC facilitators and grade level teams, the leadership will plan, check, do, and adjust our strategies to improve student and teaching performance.

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.

Cimino addresses building a positive school culture and environment by focusing on teacher leadership that utilizes the strengths of our staff members for school improvement. By being intentional about teacher leadership opportunities, we are building a culture of growth and opportunity. Each grade level team works as a Professional Learning Community with a PLC Facilitator guiding and leading the team. Within each PLC, each member plays an integral role to enhance the effectiveness of the team.

As a National School of Character, Cimino strives to maintain a student-centered school culture by recognizing when students demonstrate appropriate social skills and peer interactions. Cougar Cool Cats are awarded monthly to students who represent specific character traits that are taught and highlighted through Guidance Lessons and during SEL in every classroom. Students are play leadership roles as Safety Patrols, Operation Patriot, National Honor Society, and assigned jobs in every classroom.

At Cimino, we value our community stakeholders and we've built strategic partnerships with community businesses and organizations. Our PTA is actively involved in all aspects of our school community. Our parent volunteers work alongside us to plan for the opening of school each year by recruiting membership and promoting school spirit. Our teachers benefit from their involvement when they provide classroom grant funds and purchase necessary resources to improve the overall functioning of our school. We have also partnered with our community credit union to open a Student Run Branch to enable our students to open their own bank accounts. This initiative engages families in goal-setting and problem-solving as our students save and plan towards their future. At Cimino, we recognize that the culture of our school has far-reaching impacts on every aspect of our community; teachers, students, and parents.

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 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |