

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cannella Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Cannella Elementary School

10707 NIXON RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angela Ventura

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
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Cannella Elementary School

10707 NIXON RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[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	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

R3 = Success

Responsibility + Relationships + Respect = Success!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cannella will prepare students for life.

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
Ventura, Angela	Principal	The principal is responsible for administering and supervising the total school program and providing educational leadership for the students and staff members consistent with the educational goals of the community. These goals include establishing a climate conducive to learning, defining roles, planning and coordinating programs, effecting change, and decision-making.
Trafficante, Alexa	Assistant Principal	Under direction of the principal, assists with administering and supervising the total school program and providing educational leadership for students and staff members consistent with the educational goals of the community. These goals include establishing a climate conducive to learning, planning, and coordinating programs, affecting change, and decision making.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Angela Ventura

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

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

554

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.

4

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	83	76	80	83	94	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	504
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	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Monday 8/30/2021

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	66	79	85	91	98	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	515
Attendance below 90 percent	14	15	15	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	66	79	85	91	98	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	515
Attendance below 90 percent	14	15	15	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	5	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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				60%	52%	57%	60%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	55%	58%	59%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	53%	46%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	54%	63%	67%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	57%	62%	65%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	46%	51%	54%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	50%	53%	51%	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	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
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 Fall, Winter, and Spring Reading and Mathematics diagnostic data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	36	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	31	66
	Students With Disabilities	14	25	63
	English Language Learners	0	6	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	25	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	23	55
	Students With Disabilities	14	22	38
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	25	59

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	48	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	46	61
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	14
	English Language Learners	25	33	46
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	28	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	27	46
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	15
	English Language Learners	8	17	50
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	64	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	60	74
	Students With Disabilities	29	36	41
	English Language Learners	0	17	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	35	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	32	66
	Students With Disabilities	19	24	54
	English Language Learners	0	17	58

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	37	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	34	52
	Students With Disabilities	33	25	33
	English Language Learners	7	14	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	45	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	42	63
	Students With Disabilities	21	46	50
	English Language Learners	7	23	43
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	53	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	49	61
	Students With Disabilities	21	14	43
	English Language Learners	0	17	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	44	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	45	65
	Students With Disabilities	29	25	36
	English Language Learners	17	25	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	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	14		18	36	30					
ELL	48	45	18	56	45	50	30				
ASN	69			81							
BLK	56			32							
HSP	55	53	25	61	54	47	49				
WHT	51	27		71	64		55				
FRL	53	49	20	57	51	50	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	14	28	33	20	42	42	28				
ELL	29	49	56	53	60	53	29				
ASN	82	71		100	57						
BLK	76	59		57	44	25	53				
HSP	55	54	45	64	59	46	51				
MUL	67			83							
WHT	56	39		69	69		59				
FRL	58	55	43	64	57	42	51				
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	46	47	27	41	39	10				
ELL	40	58	56	58	69	46	25				
ASN	60	82		95	100						
BLK	61	71		59	61		42				
HSP	56	56	45	62	60	49	41				
WHT	70	55		75	68	62	64				
FRL	57	58	44	64	66	55	45				

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
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	54
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	48
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?

Targeted support of students of SWD and ELL across grade levels in reading and mathematics.

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

The lowest performance was in lowest 25th percentile and learning gains overall.

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

Need for strategic small group instruction, increase in student engagement and data analysis of common assessments.

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

Science showed the most improvement in 2019.

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

Standards based planning (grade level and vertical planning), analysis of assessments and planning to include areas of need.

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

Increased student engagement (student discourse), differentiated small group with acceleration.

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.

Instructional coaching and professional development focused on instructional priorities:

Priority #1: Increase student engagement through: effective questioning leading to opportunities for student discourse; differentiated small groups (guided reading, flexible needs) and purposeful independent follow up.

Priority #2: Increase student growth in ELA and Math through standards-based planning, data analysis of common assessments, and ongoing reflection of teaching practices.

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

Continuous feedback (formal and informal) and follow up.

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:****#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on formal and observation trends, we identified the critical need to increase student engagement.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student engagement through: effective questioning leading to opportunities for student discourse; differentiated small groups (guided reading, flexible needs) and purposeful independent follow up.
Monitoring:	Informal and formal observations and feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional coaching in reading and mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of small group instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, student engagement discussions and plans during collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible	Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our SWD rate of progress, we have identified the need for more targeted support for our SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	Provide differentiated small groups (guided reading, flexible needs) in reading and mathematics as a result of ongoing formative assessments (running records, math monthly assessments).
Monitoring:	Observations and data analysis of formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional coaching, data meetings-data analysis to differentiate instruction, purposeful planning of small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of small group instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans for differentiated instruction and use of formal assessments (exit cards) to drive instructional practices (targeted small groups based on data).

Person Responsible Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on trend FSA data, teachers need professional development meeting the academic needs of students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student growth in ELA and Math through standards-based planning, data analysis of common assessments, and ongoing reflection of teaching practices.
Monitoring:	Observations and data analysis of formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alexa Trafficante (alexa.trafficante@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional coaching, data meetings-data analysis to differentiate instruction, purposeful planning of small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of small group instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans for differentiated instruction and use of formal assessments (exit cards) to drive instructional practices (targeted small groups based on data).

Person Responsible Alexa Trafficante (alexa.trafficante@hcps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 41% in grade 4 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to the need to ensure high levels of rigor are provided during core instruction. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include all students receiving high levels of rigorous instruction, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on grade 4 ELA scores.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of grade 4 students scoring at a 3 or higher on the FSA will increase by at least 10% as measured by FSA.

Monitoring: Informal and formal observations and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional coaching in reading, collaborative planning sessions, facilitated by reading coach, focused on grade level standards and ensuring high expectations for all.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on instructional coaching as high quality professional development.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coaching by reading coach, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans focused on grade level standards and high levels of rigor for all students.

Person Responsible: Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@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.

Our school incident data ranks low as compared to other schools in the state. We are a PBIS school and we focus on ensuring a positive and safe learning environment for all students. We encourage our Cannella Comets to SOAR - S- Safety First; O- On Task; A- Always Respectful; R- Responsibility Counts. Administration and the PBIS Committee monitor behavior and discipline trends, as a result create plans to support areas of needs and ensure student incentives promote positive and safe 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.

We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home flyers, making parent link phone calls and posting everything on our website and social media. We focus on communicating every child's progress to families by engaging parents in parent/teacher conferences and sending home quarterly progress notes. School staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. We value building positive relationships with families.

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

PBIS school committee, Administration, School Counselor, Parents, Teachers all collaborate to ensure school wide PBIS expectations are met and student incentives align with these expectations. There is constant communication with parents in order to promote positive and safe behaviors. Additionally, the school counselor, school social worker, school psychologist and administration meet weekly to review school mental health and counseling needs are met.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00