Colson Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Colson Elementary School

1520 LAKEVIEW AVE, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Black

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2017

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	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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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

Colson Elementary School

1520 LAKEVIEW AVE, Seffner, FL 33584

[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	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

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

Our mission is to build and inspire a community of responsible citizens and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is empowering students to achieve success.

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
Mendez, Orestes	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Black, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	The role of an assistant principal are: meeting with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning problems. Responding to disciplinary issues. Coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Working with teachers to develop curriculum standards.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/15/2017, Rebecca Black

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.*
5

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
57

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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	87	86	114	111	99	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	14	15	11	18	15	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	18	36	34	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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 10/30/2020

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	87	113	129	111	97	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	16	15	8	15	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	1	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	7	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	87	113	129	111	97	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	16	15	8	15	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	1	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	7	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	53%	52%	57%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	55%	58%	59%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	50%	53%	57%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	54%	63%	57%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	62%	55%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	51%	40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	50%	53%	48%	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	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%	
	2018	42%	53%	-11%	57%	-15%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%	
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	56%	-11%	
Same Grade Comparison		17%					
Cohort Comparison		20%					
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%	
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		6%					
Cohort Comparison		7%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%	
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	62%	-20%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	61%	57%	4%	64%	-3%	
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		19%					
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%	
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	61%	-8%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	55%	-11%
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	14	35	32	22	44	33	4				
ELL	30	61	90	48	71	70					
BLK	51	54	46	46	57	48	30				
HSP	48	69	64	51	64	45	30				
MUL	50			73							
WHT	60	67	41	68	77	50	63				
FRL	47	59	54	53	64	49	39				
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	12	36	35	25	41	32	15				
ELL	35	33		38	50						
BLK	37	41	35	42	49	35	32				
HSP	39	39	14	52	61	26	49				
WHT	58	49	45	58	53	21	51				
FRL	41	40	27	46	51	25	39				
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	9	43	46	28	45	30	22				
ELL	29	45		45	38		18				
BLK	41	50	53	43	46	33	33				
HSP	46	55	59	52	49	20	43				
MUL	60			70							
WHT	61	66	58	67	61	61	57				
FRL	44	55	61	50	52	39	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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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	61
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	47
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	54
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	62
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	61
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	53
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 data component showing the lowest score was the area of science, with 44% achievement. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were a lack of prerequisite knowledge in natural science and lack of science integration with other content areas.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was science, with a 2% decline. The factors that contributed to this decline were a lack of prerequisite knowledge in natural science and lack of science integration with other content areas.

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 data component which had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was science. The factors that contributed to this gap were a lack of prerequisite knowledge in natural science and lack of science integration with other content areas.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was ELA bottom quartile gains. The new additions which contributed to the improvement in this area were a commitment to looking at student work to identify students needing enrich, review, and reteach and incorporating new instructional strategies to improve instruction.

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

Based on the EWS data, an area of potential concern is the student with disabilities sub group, which scored 31% achievement.

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

1. Math Low 25% gains
2. Reading Low 25% gains
3. Science % proficient

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When teachers come together to share information, resources, ideas, and expertise, learning becomes more accessible and effective for students. Collaborating means purposefully building interpersonal relationships and working towards healthy interdependence, which occurs when teachers are comfortable giving and receiving help without forfeiting accountability. Collaboration between co-teachers is necessary in order to successfully plan effective lessons that address the needs of all students.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of conducting bi-weekly standards based collaborative planning sessions with fidelity, by May 2021, K-2 i-Ready and 3-5 FSA proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25% gains will increase by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is standards based planning and instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Based Instruction, or the practice of aligning learning to standards, streamlines instruction and ensures that teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets. The rigor of the standard is maintained and expectations for student learning are clear.

Action Steps to Implement

Standards Based Instructional Design Sessions - Resource teachers
(Reading Coach, Math Coach, Teacher Leaders, and RtI Resource Teacher) will support classroom teachers in bi-weekly standards based instructional design sessions. Common assessments will be used to monitor student achievement.

Person Responsible	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A professional learning community, or PLC, is a group of educators that meets regularly, shares expertise, and works collaboratively to improve teaching skills and the academic performance of students. Colson instructional staff will incorporate the knowledge gained from Got Data? Now What? book study to further enhance PLC protocol to analyze data. The determination to continue the focus on PLCs from the previous year was due to the gains made in ELA learning gains (+18%), ELA lowest 25% (+25), Math learning gains (+12%), and Math lowest 25th% (+20%). The implementation of PLCs assisted in improving the skills and knowledge of teachers through collaborative study, expertise exchange, and professional dialogue, and improving the educational aspirations, achievement, and attainment of students through stronger leadership and teaching.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of conducting weekly PLCs with fidelity, by May 2021, FSA proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25% gains will increase by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The PLC protocol assists teachers in gathering, interpreting, and utilizing school data. The process involves steps for efficient data collection, suggested group work structures, strategies, and tools—along with essential definitions and descriptions of data types.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The determination to continue the focus on PLCs from the previous year was due to the gains made in ELA learning gains (+18%), ELA lowest 25% (+25), Math learning gains (+12%), and Math lowest 25th% (+20%). The implementation of PLCs assisted in improving the skills and knowledge of teachers through collaborative study, expertise exchange, and professional dialogue, and improving the educational aspirations, achievement, and attainment of students through stronger leadership and teaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings. Common assessments and other student data will be analyzed and used in designing highly effective instruction according to the data.

Person Responsible	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Designed differentiation is the deliberate act of modifying instruction or an assignment in order to customize the effect to match the particular developmental level and skills of a student or group of students. The ideal is to provide equivalent learning activities that cater to the students' strengths but bring all of the students to the same learning objective. Based on the 2019 FSA ELA and Math results, SWD students scored 31% proficient, below the district and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of implementing various differentiation strategies with fidelity, by May 2021, FSA proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25% gains will increase by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Purposeful grouping of students for differentiated support. Teacher employs appropriate instructional strategies (learning groups, varied resources/materials, student choice, scaffolded questioning) to meet students' needs. Teacher uses ongoing progress monitoring (informal assessments) to determine varying levels of support during a lesson. Teacher shares specific feedback on student progress throughout the lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the 2019 FSA ELA and Math results, SWD students scored 31% proficient, below the district and state averages.

Action Steps to Implement

The action steps to successfully incorporate differentiation strategies in the classroom are:
1. benchmark your students by determining students' baseline in comparison to where they need to be,
2. align to standards by determining prerequisite skills that students need to meet,
3. create individualized learning paths that target the needs of your unique students, and
4. monitor progress and formatively assess learners.

Person Responsible	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	CHAMPS is part of Randy Sprick's Safe and Civil Schools and is a research-based program with over thirty years of classroom research. The CHAMPS acronym stands for: Conversation: Can students talk to each other during this activity? Help: How do students get the teacher's attention and their questions answered? Activity: What is the task/objective? What is the end product? Movement: Can students move about during this activity? Participation: How do students show they are fully participating? What does work behavior look/sound like? Success: When students meet CHAMPS expectations, they will be successful! The implementation of CHAMPS impacts student learning by: -Improve classroom behavior (on-task, work completion, cooperation) -Establish clear classroom behavior expectations with logical and fair responses to misbehavior -Motivate students to put forth their best efforts (perseverance, pride in work) -Reduce misbehavior (disruptions, disrespect, non-compliance) -Increase academic engagement, resulting in improved test scores -Spend less time disciplining students and more time teaching them -Teach students to behave respectfully and to value diversity, thereby reducing cultural differences that may manifest as misbehavior -Feel empowered and happy to be in the classroom -Develop a common language about behaviors among all staff -Create a plan for orienting and supporting new staff -Reduce staff burnout During the 2019-2020 school year, there were 43 classroom discipline referrals issued, an increase of 9 from the previous year and 15 bus referrals, an increase of 10 from the the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2021, the overall referral count for classroom and bus areas will be reduced by 10% from the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	CHAMPS language will be communicated in all areas of the school. The consistency of language and high expectations for behavior will create an environment of respect and increased academic achievement. The CHAMPS acronym stands for: Conversation: Can students talk to each other during this activity? Help: How do students get the teacher's attention and their questions answered? Activity: What is the task/objective? What is the end product? Movement: Can students move about during this activity? Participation: How do students show they are fully participating? What does work behavior look/sound like? Success: When students meet CHAMPS expectations, they will be successful!
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	CHAMPS is part of Randy Sprick's Safe and Civil Schools and is a research-based program with over thirty years of classroom research.
Action Steps to Implement	

- Common CHAMPS language and expectations will be used school-wide. Common language and expectations will be displayed on posters throughout the school.
- Faculty will be trained in and will utilize strategies learned in CHAMPS school wide behavior system and Positive Behavior Support System.
- A behavioral monitoring committee team will be responsible for establishing and implementing a behavioral monitoring plan.
- Monthly behavioral committee meetings will be held. to analyze behavioral data and plan monthly incentives for meeting CHAMPS expectations.

Person Responsible	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	John Hattie's research identifies Self-reported grades/Student Expectations as having largest effect size on student achievement (1.44). Self-reported grades is a practice by which students assess the quality of their own work or their level of mastery over a given objective. The validity of self-grading is often assessed by comparing a student's self-reported grade with the grade provided by a teacher.
Measurable Outcome:	When analyzing various monthly assessments and collecting student survey data,
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Creating activities for students to reflect and/or predict their academic progress can reinforce student expectations. The goal is to develop student ownership of his/her academic ability and to monitor progress towards success criteria.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With an effect size of 1.33, student self reporting can provide up to three years of additional growth in learning for every year. Visible Learning was introduced by John Hattie in his groundbreaking meta study Visible Learning (2009). Hattie compared effect sizes of many aspects that influence learning outcomes. Hattie points out that in education most things work. The questions is which ones work best and where to concentrate our efforts.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will conduct individual data chats after various assessments (i-Ready diagnostic tests, Achieve 3000 check points, math monthlies, district formatives) focusing on areas of success and opportunities for growth. SMART goals will be referenced during the data chats.
Students will maintain a data binder to make predictions on success rate of various tasks and record performance data. The data binder will be used as talking points for the student during data chats and student lead conferences.
Samples of teacher and student exemplars with student friendly rubric will be posted in a visible area for classmates to reference.

Person Responsible	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@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 analyze data associated with the school-wide improvement priorities to determine effectiveness on a monthly basis.

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.

School staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. We work hard at building positive relationships with our families and community partners. 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 make every effort to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and having parent teacher conferences.
-Conference Nights
-Volunteer Orientation/Recognition -Committee Events-Great American Teach-In
-Ongoing community partnerships -Volunteer program
-Open House
-SAC/PTA -Newsletter/Websites/Edsby/Marque -Parent Link/Remind (phone text system)

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: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00