

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Collins Pk 8 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Collins Pk 8 School

12424 SUMMERFIELD BLVD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Sargable

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
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: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Collins Pk 8 School

12424 SUMMERFIELD BLVD, Riverview, FL 33579

[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)
Combination School PK-8	No	43%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

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.

Collins Elementary students will be compassionate, respectful, responsible learners who become successful citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing 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
Sargable, Rebecca	Principal	Providing strategic direction to the school, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent and community involvement, revising policies and procedures, administering the budget, hiring and evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.
Smiley, Ron	Assistant Principal	Providing strategic direction to the school, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent and community involvement, revising policies and procedures, evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/18/2020, Rebecca Sargable

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
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: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	75	149	169	148	179	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	885
Attendance below 90 percent	25	13	21	10	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	6	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	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/22/2020

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	125	170	147	181	154	174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	951
Attendance below 90 percent	10	10	4	10	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	34	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	22	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	6	7	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	2	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	140	173	150	182	167	173	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	985
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	3	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	34	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	22	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	6	7	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	2	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	58%	57%	61%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	59%	57%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	54%	43%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	56%	55%	62%	61%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	44%	57%	59%	50%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	49%	52%	41%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	57%	50%	56%	55%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	78%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
	2018	58%	53%	5%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	55%	0%	58%	-3%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	54%	6%	62%	-2%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	57%	-7%	64%	-14%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	64%	54%	10%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	51%	5%	53%	3%
	2018	60%	52%	8%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	39	35	19	26	25	9				
ELL	27	31	17	40	25	13	27				
ASN	65	57		76	50						
BLK	47	53	43	42	39	25	44				
HSP	58	56	36	59	42	31	56				
MUL	58	69		58	46						
WHT	64	56	41	60	47	19	68				
FRL	49	54	42	46	40	27	48				
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	16	23	23	25	32	25	32				
ELL	22	30	27	33	43	43					
ASN	50			79							
BLK	55	47	33	51	49	23	56				
HSP	51	48	25	58	60	52	47				
MUL	70	59		74	61		73				
WHT	66	50	40	74	61	31	83				
FRL	47	46	26	54	52	38	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	23	31	19	23	21	11	24				
ELL	28	44	31	28	38						
ASN	72	55		67	64						
BLK	58	53	38	47	45	44	35				
HSP	59	56	55	53	44	30	57				
MUL	76	68		67	52		71				
WHT	72	59	29	75	55	53	60				
FRL	53	50	42	48	51	44	41				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	62
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	42
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	51
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	58
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	51
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	48
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.

According to the 2019 FSA, Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (BQLG) was our lowest performance area at the 26th percentile, falling from 34% the previous year. Collins historically struggles with BQLGs. Our Learning Gains percentages for 3rd (60% to 83%) improved; however, the scores from 5th grade (66% to 50%) and 4th grade (49% to 35%) went down. During the 18-19 school year, we had two new teachers to 4th grade and one of them came in November. She was a brand new teacher and was responsible for 2 homerooms of math instruction (25% of the grade level). In addition, 18-19 was the "gap year" for math resources and teachers pulled from different resources to provide instruction. Transition in our ESE team also contributed to the decline in this area.

In 2019-2020, we implemented monthly math assessments to progress monitor our students and saw growth in all intermediate grade levels. We also saw increases in our Learning Gains and BQLG throughout the 2019-2020 school year.

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

Our overall Math Learning Gains decreased from 58% to 44%. Our Learning Gains percentages for 3rd (60% to 83%) improved; however, the Learning Gains from 5th grade (66% to 50%) and 4th grade (49% to 35%) went down. During the 18-19 school year, we had two new teachers to 4th grade and one of them came in November. She was a brand new teacher and was responsible for 2 homerooms of math instruction (25% of the grade level). In addition, 18-19 was the "gap year" for math resources and teachers pulled from different resources to provide instruction.

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.

According to the data from the 18-19 FSA, the largest gap, when compared to the state average is Math Lowest 25th Percentile, BQLG (25 percentage points.) The school was working on creating common performance scales across the math curriculum, as we have noticed that Math historically has been an area of development for us. Transition in our ESE team also contributed to the decline in this area.

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

For the 2018-2019 FSA, the ELA Learning Gains increased by 5 percentage points. The school had grade levels that utilized performance scales as a way to specifically focus on what the students needed to learn. It also reinforced teacher DI utilization.

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

Course failure in ELA and/or Math in grades 4 and 5.

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

1. Math Lowest 25th Percentile (as measured by FSA)
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (as measured by FSA)
3. Math Learning Gains (one years growth for all K-5)
4. ELA Learning Gains (one years growth for all K-5)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Using the 2019 FSA Data, our Learning Gains in Math were 44% and our Bottom Quartile Learning Gains were 26%.</p> <p>Using the 19-20 AP2 iReady Math Data, 44 students in Kindergarten, 100 students in First, 68 students in Second, 100 students in Third, and 83 students in Fourth, scored at least one grade level below in overall placement for Math. There were a total of 756 students tested in grades K-4. This data shows that 52% of our current year students are at least one grade level below, as measured by iReady Math.</p> <p>In addition, the 2019-2020 District Math Formative Assessment Data shows the following for Form 2. The scores from Grade 2 are 73.58, Grade 3 are 75.86, and Grade 4 are 61.17, which are higher than the District average by more than 6 percentage points, for each grade level.</p>
---	--

Measurable Outcome: 62% of K-5 students will demonstrate proficiency or make a years worth of growth by May of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ron Smiley (ron.smiley@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will utilize K-5 iReady Math Diagnostics, Grades 2-5 Monthly Math Assessments, Grades 2-5 District Math Formatives, and Grades 3-5 FSA Math data we will progress monitor our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Math iReady is differentiated to meet the needs of the students in K-5, including our ESSA groups of SWD and ELL.

Monthly Math Assessments have targeted goals set by individual student needs. Math Formatives are aligned to FSA and provide a snapshot of the standards being assessed by the State and District.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assist in providing differentiated professional development for the implementing of Florida standards, via the utilization of the assessments provided by the District (iReady, Monthly Math, and Formatives)

Person Responsible Ron Smiley (ron.smiley@hcps.net)

2. Team members will utilize the grade level standards to create common assessments based on the data during PLCs.

Person Responsible Ron Smiley (ron.smiley@hcps.net)

3. Focus on current data, achieved from common assessments and the district provided resources (iReady, Monthly Math, and Math Formatives), to drive instruction.

Person Responsible Ron Smiley (ron.smiley@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Using the 2019 FSA Data our Learning Gains in ELA were 55% and our Bottom Quartile Learning Gains were 41%. Using 19-20 AP2 iReady Reading Data, 18 students in Kindergarten, 83 students in First, 51 students in Second, 36 students in Third, and 75 students in Fourth, scored at least one grade level below in Reading overall placement. There were a total of 758 students tested in grades K-4. This data shows that 34.6% of our current year students are at least one grade level below as measured by iReady Reading. In addition, the 2019-2020 District Reading Formative Assessment Data shows the following for Form 2. The scores from Grade 2 are 52.54, Grade 3 are 47.46, and Grade 4 are 56.73, which is higher than our Form 1 data and is higher than the District average, for both forms, by more than 2 percentage points each grade level.

Measurable Outcome: 62% of K-5 students will demonstrate proficiency or make a years worth of growth by May of 2021

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will utilize K-5 iReady Reading Diagnostics, SIPPS for Grades K-2, Achieve 3000 for Grades 3-5, Grades 2-5 District Reading Formatives, and Grades 3-5 FSA Reading data we will progress monitor our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reading iReady is differentiated to meet the needs of the students in K-5, including our ESSA groups of SWD and ELL.

Reading Formatives are aligned to FSA and provide a snapshot of the standards being assessed by the State and District.

SIPPS is a research based foundational program to help new and struggling readers build skills and confidence.

Achieve 3000 is a differentiated literacy program where teachers and leaders can track progress to engage and motivate students with an understanding of their individualized goals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assist in providing differentiated professional development for the implementing of Florida standards, via the utilization of the assessments provided by the District (iReady, SIPPS, Achieve 3000, and Reading Formatives)

Person Responsible: Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

2. Team members will utilize the grade level standards to create common assessments based on the data during PLCs

Person Responsible: Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

3. Focus on current data, achieved from common assessments and the district provided resources (iReady, Formatives, SIPPS, and Achieve 3000), to drive instruction.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

The Collins Team will focus on character education, mentoring, and support to ensure a safe, caring environment where all stakeholders feel emotionally, socially, academically, and physically safe. In order for everyone to perform at their personal best, all forms of safety must be a priority. During the 19-20 school year, 59% of surveyed students indicated they have a mentor or someone that helps them succeed at school. This a 1% drop from the prior year. We are pleased to be out performing the District average in the areas of "I am proud to attend this school" (83%) and "I feel safe at school" (78%); however, we would like to continue to improve these areas as a school.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 2021, using the SCIP student question, "Do I have a mentor at school?" the student positive response will increase to 75%. In addition, we will improve the positive responses of "I am proud to attend this school" and "I feel safe at school" by at least 2 percentage points. In addition, on the 2021 ASQI Survey, 100% of the Faculty will say, "They work at a school that is safe" and "Overall, my school is a good place to work and learn."

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Start With Hello program
Character Education program
SEL curriculum for Faculty, Staff, and students
School-based mentoring program

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

With the support of creating an inclusive environment, the stakeholders will be able to identify and make connections with others, including students and adults, in order to promote and foster an appreciation for our school, each other, and the learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement effective strategies to infuse character education across the curriculum.

Person Responsible

Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

2. Reserve time, monthly, for character education lessons taught by school counselors.

Person Responsible

Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

3. Continue to enhance mentoring program for students.

Person Responsible

Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

4. Continue infusing the Start with Hello program, to promote inclusion and to ensure all students feel a part of our school family.

Person Responsible

Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

5. Continue, district approved and supported, SEL program for students and adults.

Person Responsible

Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Areas of Focus listed above, address the schoolwide improvement priorities, which are the Grades 3-5 Math and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile, as well as, the K-5 Math and ELA Learning Gains, mentioned in 2.E of the Needs Assessment/Analysis. However, the school leadership team will progress monitor these identified concerns, as well as, look at other areas for improvement as the year progresses and the data from the various assessments are completed. The goal of the school leadership team is to be proactive and not reactive to the data.

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.

Collins addresses the continued positive school culture and environment by having administration, someone from each grade level, a PTA Board member, our business and community partners, parents, and students address school performance and equity as a team, willing to voice ideas and provide feedback to address the concerns of its members.

One of the actions taken as a result of this committee meeting, is that Collins has created a mentoring program. This program continues to grow yearly with more adults participating in the program and thus, more students are benefitting. We believe that connections help build and foster the culture and addresses the needs of the students where they are at now, whether it is academically or socially.

We work to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. We also encourage parents to participate in all our events by sending newsletters, flyers, ParentLinks, Remind App, Twitter, Facebook, and our school website.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00