

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Nelson Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Nelson Elementary School

5413 DURANT RD, Dover, FL 33527

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jason Pepe

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Nelson Elementary School

5413 DURANT RD, Dover, FL 33527

[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	No	63%
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	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.

To provide an education that ensures all students

*Reach their highest potential

*Become responsible citizens

*Share a life-long love of learning

Provide the school's vision statement.

Success is our only option!

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
Pepe, Jason	Principal	<p>Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches)</p> <p>The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. <p>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.</p>
Meadows, Keri	Assistant Principal	<p>Elementary PSLT Members The leadership team includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal • Assistant Principal • School Guidance Counselor • School Psychologist • Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) • ESE teacher • PLC Liaisons for each grade level, K-5 • SAC Chair • ELP Coordinator • ELL Representative • Attendance Committee Representative • Behavior team Representative/Behavior Specialist/Coach <p>(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose of the meeting)</p> <p>PSLT Coordinator—Principal/Assistant Principal: Coordinate and oversee the decision making process to ensure integrity and consistency of the PS/RtI implementation at the building level. The principal should attend PSLT meetings</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>at the Tier 1 level, provide specific procedures for resource allocation, and monitor the fidelity of instruction/intervention at the school-wide and classroom levels (Tier 1)</p> <p>PSLT Meeting Facilitator— e.g., School Psychologist, Reading Coach, School Social Worker, Guidance Counselor, ESE Specialist, and/or Intervention Specialist: The facilitator opens the meeting with a brief description of what the team expects to accomplish during the meeting. The facilitator is to establish and maintain a supportive atmosphere throughout the meeting by encouraging participation from team members, clarifying and summarizing information communicated during the meeting, design specific procedures for ongoing communication between school staff and PSLT, and assist with monitoring the fidelity of intervention implementation across each tier.</p> <p>PSLT Content Specialist— e.g., Administrator, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Writing Coach, ESE Specialist, and/or Behavior Specialist: Ensures that when new content curricular materials are obtained, implementers are adequately trained to use the materials, check fidelity of use of curricular materials and strategies, determine what elements need to be included in an effective core instructional program and assist the team in identifying which instructional strategies are most effective to address areas of concerns. The Content Specialist may also assist with monitoring the fidelity of instruction and intervention implementation across each tier.</p> <p>PSLT Data Consultant— e.g., Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Science Coach, Academic Intervention Specialist, Behavior Specialist, Technology Support Personnel, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, ESE Specialist, and/ or Guidance Counselor: Prior to the meeting, the Data Consultant assists team members with collecting, organizing, analyzing, graphing and interpreting data. The data should be presented in easily understandable visual displays to guide the decision making process.</p> <p>PSLT Timekeeper—Ensures that meeting times are respected and helps the team stay focused on the respective agenda. Because many decisions need to be made during the meeting, the timekeeper should redirect the team’s discussion when necessary. The timekeeper should know who are working on specific projects and set timelines for completion/implementation as well as monitor the fidelity across each tier.</p> <p>PSLT Recorder—Records the plans of the team, including meeting minutes/ notes. This person will capture all important information, especially related to instruction/ intervention specifics, progress monitoring, data analysis, and future meeting dates. The recorder may need to ask for clarification several times during the meeting to ensure that enough detail is recorded so that a person who did not attend the meeting would be able to clearly understand the nature and implementation of the instructional/intervention plan</p> <p>The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Jason Pepe

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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	86	111	121	118	125	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	695
Attendance below 90 percent	11	16	17	15	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
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	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	3	3	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	107	129	117	132	138	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	9	16	11	8	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	30	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	0	0	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	1	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	107	129	117	132	138	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	9	16	11	8	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	30	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	0	0	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	1	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	63%	52%	57%	57%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	50%	53%	49%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	54%	63%	63%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	57%	62%	55%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	46%	51%	36%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	50%	53%	42%	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	64%	52%	12%	58%	6%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	55%	9%	58%	6%
	2018	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
	2018	53%	51%	2%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	54%	11%	62%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	55%	11%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	57%	7%	64%	0%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	51%	4%	53%	2%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	24	38	43	34	54	45	10				
ELL	28	42	43	36	45	44	31				
BLK	44	43	55	38	50	40	38				
HSP	52	63	45	53	54	48	44				
MUL	67	42		76	67						
WHT	73	63	58	75	75	60	67				
FRL	50	54	50	54	57	46	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	20	37	33	24	32	27	25				
ELL	24	42	41	36	36	27	25				
BLK	39	44	40	34	24	20	18				
HSP	50	56	42	47	35	25	45				
MUL	64	63		54	32		64				
WHT	67	67	52	70	56	41	65				
FRL	49	60	52	49	40	27	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	22	38	32	29	40	29	9				
ELL	33	30	39	42	41	42	13				
ASN	50			70							
BLK	40	43	58	38	30	18	11				
HSP	48	49	44	59	54	52	36				
MUL	68	29		74	57						
WHT	68	60	53	73	62	24	53				
FRL	49	47	44	54	48	35	32				

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	58
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	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	44
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	53
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math Bottom Quartile showed the lowest performance at 49%. This year's performance is actually a 20 point increase over last year's performance. In recent years Math Bottom Quartile has been 20's and 30's.

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

ELA overall gains went from 61% to 60%. Contributing factors are difficult to determining due to this only being a 1% decline

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.

Our component with the greatest gap is ELA Proficiency at 63% with state being 57%. We typically are above the state in ELA Proficiency. We continue to deliver intensive reading interventions as needed.

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

Bottom Quartile Math was our most improved component. Several factors contributed to the growth: Professional Development on Breaking Down the Standards, higher order question with students justifying their answers, and facilitated math planning with Math TDD.

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

1. The percentage of Level 1 on statewide assessment
2. Percentage of attendance below 90 percent

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

1. Increase Proficiency Levels of FSA, ELA/Math and FSSA Science
2. Increase Gains for all students in all tested areas
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Student Achievement will increase by creating an equitable student</p> <p>Student Achievement will increase by creating an equitable student</p> <p>centered culture focused on standards based instruction and differentiated interventions to meet the needs of all students.</p> <p>Rationale We will continue to focus on and engage in planning and instruction</p> <p>rooted in standards in order to meet the diverse needs of students.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Proficiency and Learning Gains will increase by 4 percentage points</p> <p>in all school grade components</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Jason Pepe (jason.pepe@hcps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Supported Standards based lesson planning.</p> <p>Use of Learning Targets and Achievement Scales</p> <p>Supporting lesson planning through our PLCs with TTD and administrative support will ensure teacher clarity and alignment of</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>tasks to the rigor of the standards.</p> <p>The use of learning targets and achievement scales will provide students with clarity regarding their performance towards standards attainment</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Create a schedule to allow grade level teams to have PLC time together for planning, and allows for academic support provided by TTDs and administration.

Person Responsible Jason Pepe (jason.pepe@hcps.net)

Weekly walk throughs by leadership team to monitor implementation of lessons aligned to the rigor of the standards and the use of learning targets and achievement scales.

Person Responsible Jason Pepe (jason.pepe@hcps.net)

Monitor subgroups progress towards standards mastery through data chats and quarterly student achievement reviews.

Person Responsible Jason Pepe (jason.pepe@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic Achievement of Students with Disabilities will increase by targeted standards based instruction with differentiated interventions. Rationale We will target our under performing subgroup (SWD) with differentiated supports and best practice strategies.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our SWD federal index to 41 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Pepe (jason.pepe@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Best teaching strategies to support a strong Tier 1. Monitor RtI/MTSS Tier 2 and 3 implementation for fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to intervention has one of the highest effect sizes as reported in Visible Learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide PD for teachers regarding best practices for inclusion.

Person Responsible Jason Pepe (jason.pepe@hcps.net)

Monitor Tier 2/3 interventions to ensure that they are a supplement to Tier 1 instruction

Person Responsible Jason Pepe (jason.pepe@hcps.net)

Monitor the IEP to ensure it appropriately addresses the students' needs.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

We work together to create a positive environment where students can reach their potential as learners and citizens of our school. In order to build a positive culture for students, we have established values and expectations that are modeled daily by all. Faculty members greet students daily and begin to build rapport. Our Social Services team facilitates several programs to promote awareness and skills to prevent bullying. These programs such as the Core Essentials, Girls on the Run, Kids on the Block foster positive behaviors. Teachers employ positive behavior systems to help students reach their social and academic goals. We have character education each month and choose an Eagle of the Month that exhibits these character traits. Students set quarterly goals and monitor their progress. Goal celebrations are held for students that meet their goals. When a student does not meet their goal, they attend Determined Eagles Nest to learn skills and strategies to support their growth towards goal attainment. Teachers strive to create learning partnerships with parents to help students feel success in their academic and social growth.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00