

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Ippolito Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Ippolito Elementary School

6874 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Eleise Medina

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (35%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Ippolito Elementary School

6874 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[ no web address on file ]

## 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	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

## 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 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 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
McManamey, Ashlee	Principal	Oversee all operations, instruction, and management of the school.
	Assistant Principal	Oversee student behavior, curriculum, and testing.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Eleise Medina

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

598

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

2

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

5

#### 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	90	92	70	105	70	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
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	14	14	12	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in Math	0	14	14	12	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	49	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	51	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	41	51	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
	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	2	2	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

#### 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	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 8/19/2021

#### 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	72	82	59	99	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	21	19	19	18	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	3	0	3	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	72	82	59	99	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	21	19	19	18	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	3	0	3	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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				38%	52%	57%	44%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	55%	58%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	50%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	54%	63%	45%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	57%	62%	60%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	46%	51%	51%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	50%	53%	25%	51%	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	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	28%	55%	-27%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	62%	-33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	57%	-25%	64%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

Primary: Wonders' Screening, PMAs, iReady, and Running Records.

Intermediate: PMAs, iReady, and Running Records

<b>Grade 1</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	35	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	25	44
	Students With Disabilities	0	23	47
	English Language Learners	17	20	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	21	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	14	32
	Students With Disabilities	6	15	32
	English Language Learners	0	0	14
<b>Grade 2</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	29	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	20	32
	Students With Disabilities	12	8	23
	English Language Learners	8	22	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	23	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	12	33
	Students With Disabilities	12	5	16
	English Language Learners	0	11	35

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	42	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	30	46
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	22
	English Language Learners	0	9	9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	24	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	14	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	9
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	24	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	13	18
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	4
	English Language Learners	0	10	9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	15	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	9	21
	Students With Disabilities	4	0	13
	English Language Learners	0	10	25

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	23	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	12	14
	Students With Disabilities	9	5	14
	English Language Learners	17	0	34
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	18	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	11	20
	Students With Disabilities	4	0	10
	English Language Learners	17	17	17
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	32	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	30	30
	Students With Disabilities	18	18	18
	English Language Learners	6	6	6

## 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	28	31		30	25		19				
ELL	32	58		33	36		10				
BLK	27	37		23	30						
HSP	39	46		41	42		28				
MUL	35			53							
WHT	47			50							
FRL	32	39	40	33	47	27	26				
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	28	34	27	35	43	45	31				
ELL	27	46		39	62		36				
BLK	30	38	33	40	47	46	24				

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	40	44	30	48	58	45	58				
MUL	62			46							
WHT	52	53		44	73						
FRL	36	45	38	40	51	47	35				
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	33	32	25	40	49	35	25				
ELL	39	46		37	57	75	15				
BLK	34	46	44	39	55	43	14				
HSP	47	51		47	63	60	32				
MUL	67			64							
WHT	56	67		53	72		44				
FRL	41	50	49	43	60	51	24				

### 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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	290
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	88%
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

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	23
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	44
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	49
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

- PLCs were not designed for content-level planning around the standards.
- Common assessments were not frequently used to drive instructional shifts.
- Content knowledge was not routinely enhanced during PD
- \*ELA Learning Gains 3rd-5th Down 7%\*
- PLCs were not designed for content-level planning around the standards.
- Common assessments were not utilized to drive instructional shifts.
- Content knowledge was not routinely enhanced during PD
- Rtl was not done with fidelity
- \*Math Learning Gains 3-5 Down 6%\*
- PLCs were not designed for content-level planning around the standards.
- Content knowledge was not routinely enhance during PD

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

- \*ELA Bottom Quartile Down 10%\*
- Teacher survey data indicated the following;
- Teachers were inconsistent with their views and practices in Rtl
- PLCs did not have a common mission or central focus when discussing the progress of students identified in the BQ
- The perceptions of using data-analysis to drive instruction did not seem useful for many staff members

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

- \*Math Achievement-18% Gap Between School and State Performance\*
- The school dismissed 15 minutes early everyday which resulted in less instructional time
- Content/grade level planning was not consistent
- PD was not routine in building teachers' knowledge of instructional practices
- \*ELA Achievement-18% Gap Between School and State Performance\*
- The school dismissed 15 minutes early everyday which resulted in less instructional time
- Content/grade level planning was not consistent
- PD was not routine in building teachers' knowledge of instructional practices
- Common assessments were not utilized

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



## 5th Grade Math

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

1. More than half of 5th grade students participated in e-Learning. The PSLT met to identify which students are not consistently attending e-Learning lessons, and those that are not making progress. Each parent was notified and encouraged to return their children to campus for face-to-face learning. Additionally, tutoring has been set up after school for students who were on e-Learning last year.
2. Quarantines impacted students' stability in their learning. Students were invited to tutoring to help fill in loss of instruction as a result of quarantining. Additionally, students have been provided current work as a hard copy to work on at home in the event they are in quarantine and don't have access to technology.
3. The student make-up of several class rosters was imbalanced due to enrollment and Covid precautions. Class rosters have been balanced so that students with accommodations are not overly saturated in one room. Also, the balanced rosters have made it easier to align ELL, ESE, and AGP support.

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

1. Students' learning tasks are aligned to learning targets
2. Assessment is used to intentionally plan for differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students

**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.**

\*ELA Achievement/Learning Gains and Math Learning Gains will Increase\*

- 1) Grade Level/Content Level PLCs will be scheduled to meet bi-weekly for 3 differing purposes; 1) Follow a standards-planning protocol for upcoming instruction, 2) Follow a common-assessment protocol to intentionally plan for next steps in instruction, and 3) RTI: Review students' response to instruction
- 2) School leadership will work with district staff in identify/designing common assessments that will be given after each anchor standard. PLCs are scheduled for teachers to use a common assessment protocol to identify trends and shifts in instruction.
- 3) Monthly PD will be conducted by site-based resource teachers. The purpose of the PD is to build teachers' knowledge around their content area
- 4) Clear expectations around Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 supports will be provided for all staff.
- 5) Fidelity walkthroughs will be conducted monthly. Each Rtl provider will receive feedback on instruction
- 6) The ILTs purpose will be clearly defined. The ILT's function will be to drive the school's look-for around the instructional priorities
- 7) Targeted walkthroughs will be conducted by the administration and the leadership team to provide frequent feedback on the school's two instructional priorities (See 1 & 2)
- 8) Quarterly academic reviews will be conducted to monitor students' progress

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

Ippolito Elementary strives every day to build, maintain, and grow positive relationships with students, families, and our community. We value these relationships and know that our students will flourish with a mutual partnership that shares a common goal: Prepare Students for Life. There are several in

which we involve all of our stakeholders.

- Weekly parent updates via mass email and text alerts
- Monthly PTA meetings
- Monthly SAC meetings
- Monthly newsletters
- Social media engagement via Twitter & Facebook
- Parent informational sessions via Zoom separated by cohorts/grade-levels
- School-wide communication system using the app Dojo
- Student progress is frequently discussed with parents via student-led and teacher-led conferences
- Student services have frequent sessions with parents and students in an effort to provide individualized support around social and emotional growth
- PEACE Committee with common expectations
- Celebrating students meeting expectations quarterly

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Area of Focus: Students' learning tasks are aligned to grade-level standards and designed to include evidence of learning. Teachers will plan aligned instruction utilizing BEST/LAFS standards. Teachers will use a backwards planning model to establish learning tasks that are directly aligned to grade-level standards. The Reading Coach and members of the Academic Leadership Team will facilitate grade level PLCs to assist staff with designing and selecting strategies and learning tasks aligned to the standards</p> <p>Rationale: ELA Proficiency on the FSA in grades 3-5 decreased 3% from 2019-2021. ELA Learning gains on the FSA decreased 2%. Additionally, the Bottom Quartile learning gains remained unchanged from 2019-2021; 38% of students in this subgroup made a learning gain. Furthermore, classroom walkthrough data indicated that 50% of teachers were providing grade-level learning tasks aligned to the standards.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Proficiency on the FSA ELA in grades 3-5 will increase from 35% to 50%. FSA ELA Learning Gains will increase from 43% to 60%. The learning gains in the bottom quartile will increase from 38% to 60%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Students' ELA growth will be monitored by using the iReady Fall, Winter, and Spring Diagnostic assessments. In conjunction with the iReady Diagnostics, teachers are administering monthly Running Records to track progress more frequently.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Ashlee McManamey (ashlee.mcmanamey@hcps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Reading outcomes are enhanced when students have access to grade-level learning tasks. Designing reading instruction is a systematic process which entails the coordination of instruction and students' learning tasks.</p> <p>-The Essential Flipbook for Achieving Rigor by Amy Dugon</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	There is a need for ongoing authentic task alignment to instruction of the standards. This is evidenced by student assessment data, walkthroughs, and teacher observations. Students are more likely to learn when instruction and learning tasks are intentionally focused to grade-level standards.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Scheduling: The master schedule was created to provide as many opportunities as possible for teachers to have common planning during the school day. The grade-level PLCs have been strategically scheduled on Tuesday afternoons. This is a mandatory staff meeting day so it provides an uninterrupted time for teachers to have common planning. In addition, the Reading Coach, Math Coach, Assistant Principal, and Principal have scheduled after school meeting times to facilitate additional common planning with grades.

**Person Responsible** Ashlee McManamey (ashlee.mcmanamey@hcps.net)

Protocols: Establish common protocols for planning. This includes PLC Norms, expectations of attendance, and planning templates that keep teachers focused on delivering and designing instruction and learning tasks that are aligned to grade-level standards. Teachers will utilize effective planning protocols during common planning sessions led by members of the academic leadership team. The protocols include the following steps; (1) Internalization the standard(s) and learning tasks for the lessons being designed, (2) Identify strategies that are appropriate within each unit of study, (3) Intentionally plan segments of the lesson that includes independent practice and aligned learning tasks, (4) Plan a checkpoint and time for feedback on learning tasks, and (5) Design small group instruction.

**Person Responsible** Ashlee McManamey (ashlee.mcmanamey@hcps.net)

Leadership Meetings: Establish weekly Academic Leadership meetings in which student and walkthrough data/trends are discussed. Agendas for these meetings have an outcome-based protocol to ensure there is follow-through and fidelity with all leadership members' roles. Norms and expectations for the Academic Leadership meetings will be set.

**Person Responsible** Ashlee McManamey (ashlee.mcmanamey@hcps.net)

Hire Reading Coach: A Reading Coach will be hired to assist in the role of improving the teaching and learning of ELA instruction. The Reading Coach will facilitate reading data chats to assist teachers with whole group and small group instruction. Reading Coach will provide specific instructional support to prioritized students in grades 3-5, both in the Lowest Quartile and in our identified ESSA subgroups (Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black/African American, and Economically Disadvantaged). Monitoring: The principal will monitor the Reading Coach's coaching log, observe the Coach during coaching and planning sessions and provide feedback.

**Person Responsible** Ashlee McManamey (ashlee.mcmanamey@hcps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

**IPPOLITO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-1951 reported 1.3 incidents per 100 students. This rate is greater than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. The school incident rating is categorized as High. The Suspension Rate is ranked as Very Low.**

**Ippolito has established the PEACE Committee. This is a group of staff who meets frequently to establish proactive systems to support students with expectations and positive behaviors.**

### 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.**

Ippolito Elementary strives every day to build, maintain, and grow positive relationships with students, families, and our community. We value these relationships and know that our students will flourish with a mutual partnership that shares a common goal: Prepare Students for Life. There are several in which we involve all of our stakeholders.

- Weekly parent updates via mass email and text alerts
- Monthly PTA meetings
- Monthly SAC meetings
- Monthly newsletters
- Social media engagement via Twitter & Facebook
- Parent informational sessions via Zoom separated by cohorts/grade-levels
- School-wide communication system using the app Dojo
- Student progress is frequently discussed with parents via student-led and teacher-led conferences
- Student services have frequent sessions with parents and students in an effort to provide individualized support around social and emotional growth
- The Ron Clark House System was adopted. The purpose of the house system is to create a strong sense of community and a positive school culture

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

- Administration
- SAC
- All Staff

## 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
Total:			\$0.00