Moton Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Moton Elementary School

7175 EMERSON RD, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/mes

Demographics

Principal: Patty Martin D   Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Hernando 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

Moton Elementary School

7175 EMERSON RD, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/mes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

Moton Elementary School, is a place of excellence where students realize their full potential, respect core values such as compassion, integrity, and determination and achieve academic success through active engagement so that as citizens of our community they will contribute to its growth and success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Showing P.R.I.D.E in all we do!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martin, Patty	Principal	
Sauvageot, Stephanie	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/14/2021, Patty Martin D

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
48

Total number of students enrolled at the school
570

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				40%	54%	57%	42%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	53%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	52%	53%	58%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	58%	63%	46%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	57%	62%	49%	53%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	48%	51%	30%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	54%	53%	66%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	38%	57%	-19%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	59%	-19%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	52%	-14%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	62%	-18%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	33%	62%	-29%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5					
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall		Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners				
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall		Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners				
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall		Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners				

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8	17		11	47	58	21				
ELL	13	40		27	80						
BLK	26	35		25	37		18				
HSP	46	53		49	75		36				
MUL	33			47							
WHT	47	46		57	61		52				
FRL	35	43	33	45	60	56	36				
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	18	35	33	24	48	50					
ELL	35	67		63	69						
BLK	22	38	50	20	31	36	30				

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
HSP	37	59		49	59		36				
MUL	69			69							
WHT	46	45	21	46	57	64	54				
FRL	38	46	41	38	50	57	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	22	30	38	21	35	17	40				
ELL	25	60		50	55						
BLK	18	43		27	39		43				
HSP	35	50		48	48	30	69				
MUL	75	64		73	60						
WHT	51	59	48	51	52	28	76				
FRL	39	52	59	42	45	29	63				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2021 Florida Standards Assessment in English Language Arts our 5th grade students were 33% proficient and 67% were not proficient and did not score a level 3 or higher on the assessment. Our 4th grade students were 34% proficient in on the Florida Standards Assessment in English Language Arts and 66% were not proficient and did not score a level 3 or higher. Our 3rd grade students were 46% proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment in English Language Arts and 54% were not proficient and did not score a level 3 or higher. Based on our progress monitoring assessment data from the iReady AP 3 Diagnostic our 2nd grade students were 46% proficient and 54% of our students were not on track to be proficient or above level.
Measurable Outcome:	Our ELA proficiency in 5th grade will increase by 4% from 33% to 37% proficient for the grade level (these students scored 34% proficient in 4th grade). Our ELA proficiency in 4th grade will increase by 16% from 34% to 50% proficient for the grade level (these students scored 46% proficient in 3rd grade, which is why we have a higher goal). Our ELA proficiency in 3rd grade will increase by 4% from 46% to 50% proficient for the grade level (these students scored 46% proficient in 2nd grade on their iReady AP 3 Diagnostic) Our ELA proficiency in 2nd grade on the iReady AP 3 Diagnostic will increase by 16% from 46% to 62% proficient for the grade level (these students scored 59% proficient in 1st grade on their iReady AP 3 Diagnostic)
Monitoring:	Through weekly walkthroughs focused on alignment to standards with a focus on student engagement and formative assessments. Also, through weekly facilitative lesson planning in which coaches and/or admin will attend and work collaboratively with teachers to plan standards based lessons using evidence based strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Grade level teachers will participate in facilitative planning specifically following the new BEST standards with a focus on evidence based strategies. They will be using the new Tier I Wonders Curriculum aligned to the BEST Standards to plan and predict possible student misconceptions, which is a 0.76 effect based on Hattie's research. Teachers will be creating and evaluating standards based formatives, which is a 0.48 effect based on Hattie's research, and providing specific feedback to students, which is a 0.70 effect based on Hattie's research. This data will be used to drive classroom instruction including response to intervention instruction, which is a 1.29 effect based on Hattie's research. We focused on facilitative planning last year and saw improvements in student growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our 2nd grade students scored 12% proficient(88% not proficient) on iReady AP1 Diagnostic at the beginning of the year and 46% were proficient(54% not proficient) on AP3 Diagnostic at the end of the year. Our 3rd grade students scored 19% proficient(81% not proficient) on iReady AP1 Diagnostic and 40% were proficient(60% not proficient) on AP3 Diagnostic at the end of the year. Our 4th grade students scored 17% proficient(83% not proficient) on iReady AP1

Diagnostic and 29% were proficient(71% not proficient) on AP3 Diagnostic at the end of the year.
Our 5th grade students scored 6% proficient(94% not proficient) on iReady AP1 Diagnostic and 14% were proficient(86% not proficient) on AP3 Diagnostic at the end of the year.

We want to add a focus on standards-based formative assessments to drive instruction, including response to intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule set planning times per grade levels each week

Person Responsible	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan weekly and bi-weekly walkthroughs with specific look fors.

Person Responsible	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan for data chats to discuss iReady and formative data and how it is being used to drive instruction.

Person Responsible	Alexa Neal (neal_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Review monthly data from Danielson specific to 1E & 3C to review and plan next steps

Person Responsible	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on data from the 2021 Employee Engagement survey where only 81.67% of the staff feel like they are recognized for their work accomplishments and only 81.66% feels like we celebrate successes, I will plan out ways to recognize my staff for their accomplishments.
Measurable Outcome:	An increase, to above 90% in these areas on the 2022 Employee Engagement survey.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored by the follow through of the plan for recognizing staff and informal staff survey mid-way through the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Plan activities and way to recognize our staff beyond what we currently are doing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

Meet with Leadership team to plan "valuable" ways to recognize staff for any time they improve and areas of focus

Person Responsible	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Last year, we had 163 disciplines for disrespect, 130 for physical contact and 83 for classroom disruption. Our black students risk ratio decreased to 2.09 and our students with disability decreased to .80 and our white students is .91. We have been implementing Mind Up curriculum, which is research based and supports students in being mindful of their own feelings and actions. We will also fully implement Sanford Harmony which is a research based SEL curriculum that has been proven to help students better regulate their emotions and lower disciplines. Also, based on our Student Survey, 84.94% of our students feel they keep trying when things are difficult. This is not what the teachers see in the classroom so we want to continue our focus on Mind Up which teaches about perseverance and the power of yet. Most importantly, the 87% of our students feel they are kind to other students. Again, we do not see this based on our discipline data. Our schoolwide focus will be on what it means to be kind.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the number of disciplines by 20% and improve risk ratios for my black and SWD students.
Monitoring:	Bi-Weekly "proactive" meetings to discuss disciplines and problem solving by admin and dean. Proactive parent meetings during open house to put a behavior plan in place. Mentoring program with a focus on academics and behaviors- competition among groups. Teacher and student led data chats to set both behavior and academic goals. RtI B data shared at monthly School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony and Mind Up
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Both SEL programs are researched based and supports students in being mindful of their own feelings and actions and have proven to help students better regulate their emotions and lower disciplines.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide PD to staff on Sanford Harmony & review of Mind Up

Person Responsible	Alexa Neal (neal_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Common time first thing in morning after announcement to do "Morning Meetings" - Do fidelity checks

Person Responsible	Alexa Neal (neal_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Support struggling teachers with side-by-side teaching and/or modeling

Person Responsible	Erin Casey (casey_e@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Model use of programs throughout PD, faculty meetings and SBLT meetings.

Person Responsible	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00