Seminole County Public Schools

Hamilton Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hamilton Elementary School

1501 E 8TH ST, Sanford, FL 32771

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0021

Demographics

Principal: Adrian Fuller

Start Date for this Principal: 10/19/2015

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)	86%
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 (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Seminole 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

Hamilton Elementary School

1501 E 8TH ST, Sanford, FL 32771

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0021

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	84%

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole 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.

The mission of Hamilton Elementary School of Engineering and Technology is to promote innovative thinking through discovery of real world opportunities that foster collaborative problem-solving to pursue excellence in student achievement and preparedness for success in a technologically complex global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hamilton Elementary School of Engineering and Technology's vision is to provide all of our students with the necessary tools to "Think Like an Engineer" and solve problems independently.

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
Pfeiffer, Michael	Principal	Oversees total school program.
Fuller, Adrian	Assistant Principal	Assists principal in overseeing total school program.
MacDonald, Jennifer	Other	Magnet Coordinator, Facilities, Curriculum Support.
Crawford, Linda	Instructional Coach	PLCs, Curriculum Implementation, Coaching, PBS.
Melin, Merissa	Instructional Coach	PLCs, Curriculum Implementation, Coaching.
Sink, Amy	Instructional Coach	PLCs, Curriculum Implementation, Coaching.
Staley, Heather	Instructional Coach	PLCs, Curriculum Implementation, Coaching.
Thomas, Amy	Instructional Coach	PLCs, Curriculum Implementation, Coaching.
Kuhn, Susan	Instructional Technology	Instructional technology implementation and support, Communications, Media Center.
Closson, Claire	School Counselor	SST, MTSS, Small Group Counseling, Parent Conferences.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/19/2015, Adrian Fuller

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.*

1

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

651

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

13

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

7

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	99	109	113	104	104	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	645
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	3	19	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	1	6	2	2	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	22	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	20	24	22	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
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 8/27/2021

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	76	106	116	101	106	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
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	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	1	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	7	16	16	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
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	76	106	116	101	106	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
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	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	1	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	7	16	16	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
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				48%	67%	57%	45%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	61%	58%	46%	58%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	51%	53%	44%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	70%	63%	57%	68%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	66%	62%	51%	62%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	50%	51%	23%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	62%	53%	75%	66%	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	46%	67%	-21%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	65%	-14%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	64%	-22%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	56%	71%	-15%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	72%	-13%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	65%	-26%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	40%	62%	-22%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic Assessments were utilized to progress monitor*:
• ELA – Grades 1-5
• Mathematics – Grades 1-5
In Grade 5 Science, teacher based formative assessments were used for progress monitoring. Data is unavailable for these assessments.
*Reported data is based upon having 10 or more students in the subgroup. Less than 10 students will be reported as 0.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/33%	35/37%	56/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/29%	29/33%	49/54%
	Students With Disabilities	4/18%	4/21%	5/26%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/17%	29/31%	50/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/13%	23/27%	44/48%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	2/12%	3/16%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/32%	34/34%	49/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/27%	25/29%	38/40%
	Students With Disabilities	5/14%	4/11%	6/15%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21/22%	38/37%	58/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/17%	29/33%	46/49%
	Students With Disabilities	4/11%	8/22%	14/36%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11/13%	21/23%	35/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/12%	18/22%	30/37%
	Students With Disabilities	1/3%	3/8%	8/22%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14/17%	30/34%	55/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/16%	25/32%	48/59%
	Students With Disabilities	1/3%	6/16%	16/44%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/32%	36/35%	45/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/27%	28/31%	35/38%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	2/10%	3/15%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27/29%	51/51%	56/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/24%	42/48%	45/51%
	Students With Disabilities	4/18%	4/20%	7/35%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24/26%	29/31%	36/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/20%	22/27%	28/24%
	Students With Disabilities	2/9%	1/4%	1/4%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37/45%	40/45%	48/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/43%	32/42%	40/49%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	4/19%	4/17%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	25	33	36	34	30	21	19				
ELL	35			42							
BLK	36	41	50	37	34	23	41				
HSP	41	52		56	46		44				
MUL	56			33							
WHT	64	58		67	58		79				
FRL	43	46	57	47	36	22	46				

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	25	39	44	33	48	47	24				
ELL	45	50		36	55						
BLK	40	50	45	44	47	45	35				

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	49	54	33	52	51	31	44				
MUL	64			50							
WHT	60	65		75	73		73				
FRL	46	53	47	50	51	38	43				

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	14	32	32	28	30	12	55				
ELL	38	48		69	67						
BLK	36	37	42	45	38	16	70				
HSP	51	57	43	62	58	35	81				
WHT	55	50		77	70		78				
FRL	44	46	45	55	50	23	74				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

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%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	37
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	52
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	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	65
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	46
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?

The performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

The achievement and learning gains of students with disabilities demonstrates 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?

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Progress monitoring data reflects improvement for ELA and mathematics at all grade levels.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student 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.

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support; and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Pfeiffer (michael_pfeiffer@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Student owned progress monitoring
Low 30% Monitoring
High Level 1 and High Level 2 Monitoring
Low Level 3 Acceleration
Collaborative Data Driven PLCs
Tutoring
See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible	Michael Pfeiffer (michael_pfeiffer@scps.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improving Reading/ELA instruction for all students. FSA achievement data reflects that less than 50% of students scored a level 3 or above on the 2021 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome will be an increase in the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above on the spring 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA and iReady outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Pfeiffer (michael_pfeiffer@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data.
Utilizing results of DRA and iReady diagnostics to design reading acceleration support for students.
Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions.
Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction.
Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block.
Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.
See Seminole County Public Schools' School Improvement Plan for additional details.

Person Responsible	Michael Pfeiffer (michael_pfeiffer@scps.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.

Hamilton Elementary has an incident ranking that is less than the norm for Florida schools. We will monitor discipline data through the MTSS process for individual students, and through PBS team meetings to review school wide discipline and behavior data. The PBS team will analyze how our school culture initiatives are impacting student behavior at Hamilton.

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.

Hamilton Elementary builds a positive school culture by starting with clear expectations for students, staff, and visitors. The main expectation is, "At Hamilton we treat each other with kindness." We implement a school wide Positive Behavior System that recognizes and reinforces positive behaviors from our students. Hamilton has been awarded the FLPBIS Resilience Award for the 2020-21 school year. Hamilton Elementary is a Restorative Practices school, and we implement restorative circles within our classrooms to build a positive culture and environment. We also implement restorative circles in our meetings and staff trainings.

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

School Administration: Setting school wide expectations, provide feedback, training, and support. Teachers: Build relationships with students, parents, and fellow teachers. Students: Build relationships with teachers, staff and peers. Responding positively to school culture initiatives Families: Communicating with school staff regarding student concerns or successes Partners in Education: Supporting School initiatives School Advisory Council: Communicate with school administration, and share information with our community.