Mintz Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mintz Elementary School

1510 HEATHER LAKES BLVD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 5/4/2009

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 (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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

Mintz Elementary School

1510 HEATHER LAKES BLVD, Brandon, FL 33511

[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	75%

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To develop leadership potential in all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating Lifelong Leaders

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
Moltisanti, Deborah	Principal	Responsible for planning, coordinating, implementing, and oversight of all school programs
Koplin, Heidi	Assistant Principal	Responsible for oversight of curriculum and teacher training
Turbee, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Lighthouse Coordinator - facilitates the school Lighthouse Team
Nunn, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Lighthouse Coordinator - facilitates the school Lighthouse Team
Almodovar, Heyde	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Professional Learning
Hays, Sheila	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Student-Led Achievement
Howell, Beth	Instructional Media	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Leadership Events
Savary, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Family Learning
Shoup, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Leadership Environment
Velez, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader -Student Learning

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 5/4/2009, Kevin Martin

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

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 (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	115	124	145	127	120	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	9	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	16	31	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	32	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 6/11/2020

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	123	148	128	134	132	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	835
Attendance below 90 percent	14	17	13	14	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	27	44	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	44	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	6	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	5	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	123	148	128	134	132	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	835
Attendance below 90 percent	14	17	13	14	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	27	44	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	44	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	6	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	5	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	54%	52%	57%	56%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	55%	58%	58%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	57%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	54%	63%	65%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	57%	62%	68%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	46%	51%	54%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	50%	53%	54%	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	58%	52%	6%	58%	0%
	2018	58%	53%	5%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	57%	0%	64%	-7%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	17	38	38	34	35	29	19				
ELL	38	48	57	53	60	50	38				
ASN	87			80							
BLK	45	53	46	55	56	48	40				
HSP	51	48	47	57	57	52	48				
MUL	71	56		62	69		82				
WHT	57	59	67	71	65	50	71				
FRL	49	51	49	56	56	50	49				
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	27	58	52	45	58	42	38				
ELL	42	54		51	56	60					
BLK	48	55	52	49	56	46	38				
HSP	50	48	42	58	61	37	62				
MUL	62	55		75	86		62				
WHT	65	66	67	74	67	58	73				
FRL	49	52	52	57	61	49	55				

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	31	41	37	37	59	47	23				
ELL	50	65		63	83						
ASN	93			86							
BLK	47	51	52	49	55	35	39				
HSP	50	55	60	61	71	66	44				
MUL	57	53		70	53						
WHT	69	69		83	78		75				
FRL	50	58	56	60	67	54	48				

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	57
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	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	84
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
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	68
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	63
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	55
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 2 lowest performing areas were 5th grade ELA and 5th grade Science, both at 51%. 5th grade ELA always tends to score lower than 4th grade. Science data tends to fluctuate from year to year. Our grade 5 classes in 2018-19 were larger than normal (27-28 students).

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

Greatest decline was 5th grade Math, however this data reflected a gain of 3% for this cohort of students. The decline is reflected in that this was a low scoring group the year prior.

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.

Two greatest gaps compared to the state were 4th grade ELA and Math. We have a 2-year trend of scoring below the state in these areas.

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

The greatest improvement was in 3rd grade Math. The 3rd grade PLC did team planning and data analysis.

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

Students with Attendance below 90%
Students scoring Level 1 on FSA

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

1. Learning gains for all students in Reading
2. Learning gains for all students in Math
3. Learning gains for bottom quartile students in Reading & Math
4. Learning gains for SWD subgroup
5. Learning gains for Hispanic subgroup

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By building a culture for learning in our school, we can: Build pride and ownership in a student's work. Include self-reflection and self-assessment in all work tasks. Teach students to set goals and they give specific feedback in their goal attainment. Challenge students to surpass the predetermined goals so they can set new goals. Create a voice in each student that will advocate for themselves, especially their learning.
Measurable Outcome:	The Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment, to be administered in Spring 2021, will be positively impacted in the areas targeted for growth by each of the school's Action Teams.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Leader in Me
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Continued implementation of The Leader in Me, embodying a holistic approach to education, redefining how schools measure success. This approach empowers educators with effective practices and tools to: Teach LEADERSHIP to every student, Create a CULTURE of student empowerment, Align systems to drive results in ACADEMICS.

Action Steps to Implement

Designate 2 Teacher Leaders, who are released from instruction .5 each day to monitor and strengthen The Leader In Me initiative in all classrooms with fidelity.

Person Responsible	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Professional development by Franklin Covey consultant with Lighthouse (Leadership) Team to strengthen them in their roles as teacher leaders of their respective Action Teams.

Person Responsible	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Faculty Workshop, Core 2. Full day training to reinforce 7 Habits principles. This training is intended to help staff live the content of the 7 Habits and fully integrate it into their classrooms.

Person Responsible	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Lead Time Walkthroughs to provide coaching and support on integrating 7 Habits principles and practices in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to meet our students needs in the area of ELA, we will need to continue to focus on designing instruction that will meet students at their current level and identify practices that will move them toward proficiency. By building a culture for learning in our school, we can: Build pride and ownership in a student's work. Include self-reflection and self-assessment in all work tasks. Teach students to set goals and they give specific feedback in their goal attainment. Challenge students to surpass the predetermined goals so they can set new goals. Create a voice in each student that will advocate for themselves, especially their learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Schoolwide Wildly Important Goal (WIG) - 100% of students at Mintz Elementary will attain their stretch reading goal as measured by iReady Reading by May 2021. 64% of students will score Level 3 and higher on 2021 FSA ELA. 63% of students will demonstrate learning gains on 2021 FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Leader in Me Professional Learning Communities Standards-Based Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Continued implementation of The Leader in Me, embodying a holistic approach to education, redefining how schools measure success. This approach empowers educators with effective practices and tools to: Teach LEADERSHIP to every student, Create a CULTURE of student empowerment, Align systems to drive results in ACADEMICS.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Aligning Academics 2: Impact Journey training
2. PLCs focused on unpacking the standards, planning for instruction, and monitoring student data
3. Leadership Notebook implementation
4. Coaching and support from our LIM coach
5. Tutors will support struggling students and help in implementing interventions
6. Teacher Leaders will serve as model classrooms

Person Responsible	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to meet our students needs in the area of ELA, we will need to continue to focus on designing instruction that will meet students at their current level and identify practices that will move them toward proficiency. By building a culture for learning in our school, we can: Build pride and ownership in a student's work. Include self-reflection and self-assessment in all work tasks. Teach students to set goals and they give specific feedback in their goal attainment. Challenge students to surpass the predetermined goals so they can set new goals. Create a voice in each student that will advocate for themselves, especially their learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Schoolwide Wildly Important Goal (WIG) - 100% of students at Mintz Elementary will attain their stretch reading goal as measured by iReady Math by May 2021. 70% of students will score Level 3 and higher on 2021 FSA Math. 70% of students will demonstrate learning gains on 2021 FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Leader in Me Professional Learning Communities Standards-Based Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Continued implementation of The Leader in Me, embodying a holistic approach to education, redefining how schools measure success. This approach empowers educators with effective practices and tools to: Teach LEADERSHIP to every student, Create a CULTURE of student empowerment, Align systems to drive results in ACADEMICS.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Aligning Academics 2: Impact Journey training
2. PLCs focused on unpacking the standards, planning for instruction, and monitoring student data
3. Leadership Notebook implementation
4. Coaching and support from our LIM coach
5. Tutors will support struggling students and help in implementing interventions
6. Teacher Leaders will serve as model classrooms

Person Responsible	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning Gains for ESE students Rationale: In 2018-19, Exceptional students scored 30% in ESSA data
Measurable Outcome:	ESE student ESSA data will improve from 30% to 42% as shown by 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Leader in Me 4 Disciplines of Execution
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Involving students in the process of improvement increases the likelihood of buy-in and personal responsibility.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data conferences with individual students will identify a skill gap for each.
2. Set a goal of reaching stretch goals, as measured by iReady
3. Identify lead measures for each student to incorporate addressing specific skill gap
4. Monitor implementation with an accountability partner.
5. Monitor growth data through regular assessments

Person Responsible   Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Student Services Team will develop and implement steps to address students with attendance concerns.

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.

The Leader in Me is a whole school approach. designed to engage students, staff, and families in changing paradigms around our definitions of student leadership and success. Part of our initiative involves bringing training to families, in the form of 7 Habits for Highly Effective families.
We maintain a PTA and SAC to engage the community in providing feedback about our school.

The Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment seeks feedback from all stakeholders, and we use the data to inform our annual goal setting for The Leader in Me.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00