

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Chiles 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Chiles Elementary School

16541 TAMPA PALMS BLVD W, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Todd Connolly

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (69%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Chiles Elementary School

16541 TAMPA PALMS BLVD W, Tampa, FL 33647

[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 KG-5	No	35%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a nurturing and safe environment in which all children aspire to become tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become the district's leader in developing successful students.

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
Evans, Teresa	Principal	Chairs the Leadership Team, schedules meetings.
Gilford, Yessica	Teacher, K-12	Represents the specials teachers on the team.
Williams, Joanne	Teacher, K-12	Represents 4th grade
Erickson, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	Represents 5th grade
Rubino, Kaleigh	Teacher, K-12	Represents the Kindergarten team.
Kusmierz, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	Represents 1st grade
Huff, Kim	Instructional Media	Coordinates issues with media and technology.
Egeland, Ami	Teacher, K-12	represents 2nd grade
Zang, Michael	Teacher, K-12	represents 3rd grade

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/15/2013, Todd Connolly

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.*

6

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

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

865

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.

3

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	124	144	162	167	121	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	865
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	8	6	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	19	20	18	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Wednesday 9/1/2021

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	131	151	150	133	162	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	11	6	13	15	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	131	151	150	133	162	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	11	6	13	15	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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				82%	52%	57%	81%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	55%	58%	71%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	50%	53%	60%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				85%	54%	63%	83%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	57%	62%	81%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	46%	51%	61%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				85%	50%	53%	79%	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	76%	52%	24%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	57%	28%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	81%	51%	30%	53%	28%
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, Science Baseline and Midyear tests

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	78	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	62	80
	Students With Disabilities	43	71	82
	English Language Learners	17	29	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	42	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	31	51
	Students With Disabilities	26	38	54
	English Language Learners	13	23	41
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	55	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	46	56
	Students With Disabilities	40	49	58
	English Language Learners	22	33	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	41	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	29	47
	Students With Disabilities	27	43	55
	English Language Learners	8	20	37

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59	68	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	59	66
	Students With Disabilities	56	63	68
	English Language Learners	34	43	52
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	37	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	26	44
	Students With Disabilities	29	41	54
	English Language Learners	7	16	33
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57	63	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	55	61
	Students With Disabilities	56	59	65
	English Language Learners	35	40	46
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	40	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	29	47
	Students With Disabilities	34	42	54
	English Language Learners	11	19	36

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	66	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	58	63
	Students With Disabilities	61	63	69
	English Language Learners	39	44	48
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	41	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	30	43
	Students With Disabilities	36	45	54
	English Language Learners	9	18	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	70.7	68.32	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.75	50.34	
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	47.50	41.88	

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	35	42	30	40	42	36	27				
ELL	77	76	73	85	76		53				
ASN	93	89		96	83		83				
BLK	53	60		58	50		41				
HSP	80	59		80	56	40	58				
MUL	74			84							
WHT	85	59	30	84	68		75				
FRL	61	58	42	63	52	35	47				
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	41	48	33	55	60	67	62				
ELL	63	71	72	82	77	57	86				

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
ASN	85	91		94	95		96				
BLK	79	62	45	72	77	71	77				
HSP	75	62	59	83	70	58	74				
MUL	81	76		73	81	64	77				
WHT	87	65	64	90	82	65	90				
FRL	71	66	58	76	76	63	78				
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	38	66	60	46	72	59	10				
ELL	75	80	84	82	82	60	78				
ASN	93	84		97	94		93				
BLK	69	60	41	69	73	70	62				
HSP	71	69	71	77	72	50	76				
MUL	87	74		71	74						
WHT	86	71	53	89	84	67	84				
FRL	70	67	59	74	80	69	71				

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	63
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	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	71
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	85
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	52
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	59
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	79
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	66
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	51
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?

Data from 2020-2021 reflects proficiency levels in Reading and Math that are within normal ranges for the past four years. Considering that nearly half of our students began the year in eLearning--which was a completely new modality for students and teachers--and there was a lot of transition in and out of eLearning throughout the year, proficiency scores met our expectations. Gains scores in Reading and Math were below our expectations and our norms. Bottom quartile gains in both Reading and Math dropped significantly. On state assessments, these gains scores were based entirely on fifth grade students that had matching scores from two years ago. The very low Science proficiency score was also only based on those fifth grade students. Because proficiency scores in third and fourth grades were in our normal range, we cannot consider the 20-21 fifth grade scores to be a trend.

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

Bottom quartile gains in math were dismal. And Math gains in general were lower than in Reading. These state results, along with trends in primary math scores being lower than reading scores, point to Math as a focus for improvement going forward.

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

Because 20-21 was a school year unlike any other, contributing factors can be difficult to identify. It is possible that math was more difficult for our teachers to instruct virtually than reading and language arts. In the state data, it is most likely that the changes in teachers during the year had a negative impact. One 5th grade math/science teacher left in November, and another left in January. These teachers were difficult to replace and the change caused a disruption in learning.

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

There were no significant improvements. But maintaining our proficiency levels was a win.

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

In all grade levels, the major factors in our success were our teachers. They adapted to completely new ways of teaching, connected with students and families in new ways, and were constantly innovating throughout the year. Much of the success was through sheer will and effort on the part of our entire staff.

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

Primary students that were in eLearning need to adjust quickly to being in the school building and learning about the culture of school. Our staff is working to create a high performing culture while keeping students socially distanced and safe. Strategic assessments and small group instruction will be important.

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.

We will focus on learning about new standards and curriculum in primary grades, and in learning and implementing AVID strategies in all grades. AVID strategies will focus on making learning stick, vocabulary, and engagement.

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

Our PLC structure and a high level of distributive leadership will help to transition from a long-time, high performing staff to new, innovative, energetic additions to our staff family. The team approach as our way of work has been successful and will continue to result in high performance in all grade levels. Teachers are strongly encouraged to try out new strategies to reach low performing learners. We will work to get all teachers trained in AVID and continue our path in becoming an AVID demonstration school. Vocabulary and communication will be emphasized in all content areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While our proficiency scores in Math and ELA were within our normal range, our bottom quartile did not make the gains that we expect in either subject. The bottom quartile is primarily SWD and other subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	60% of our bottom quartile will make gains in ELA. 60% of our bottom quartile will make gains in Math.
Monitoring:	Data will be collected and discussed after each assessment, with a particular emphasis on struggling students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Galfond (ashley.galfond@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District plans for ACCELERATION will be implemented, providing students with remediation only as needed and in specific timely sessions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	District mandate; as well as an understanding that we need to teach students on level and provide support.

Action Steps to Implement

Small group instruction to meet student needs.

Person Responsible Teresa Evans (teresa.evans@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lower than usual proficiency scores in 2021. Our science leader has retired. This is a cultural transition for our school. In addition to a focus on lower performing students, we will need to focus on our gifted students to make sure they continue to excel.

Measurable Outcome: FSA Science 3+ will be at least 80%

Monitoring: Data will be analyzed and discussed after all assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley Galfond (ashley.galfond@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Grades k-4 will use more hands on, minds on strategies in teaching science. Students appear to be successful in science in these grades, but do not retain the content as they move toward 5th grade. It is impossible to teach k-5 science in 5th grade. They have to have meaningful science activities that will provide a foundation in science that will stick with them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are able to memorize content and are successful in earlier grades. But they do not remember the content when they get to 5th grade. Hands on activities provide opportunities to not just learn science, but to remember what they learn.

Action Steps to Implement

Long term investigations in all science classrooms.

Person Responsible Teresa Evans (teresa.evans@hcps.net)

Full participation in district science events.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

Since Chiles opened in 2001, we have had excellent, experienced teachers. Engaging and well-planned lessons result in significantly fewer behavior problems. We will monitor lunch behavior and implement a more strategic system to recognize good and poor behavior in the cafeteria. Bus behavior can be challenging, but we address it quickly and decisively to discourage growth in negative 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.

According to our 2021 Insight data, Chiles ranked well above the district average and at the top of Hillsborough's top quartile in all areas. Hiring decisions include multiple teachers to insure compatibility. Our team approach to our work and our communication help to quickly inculcate new staff to our "whatever it takes" mentality. Teachers are respected and trusted to make instructional decisions. Stakeholder groups are important to our school culture. We are committed to open and frequent communication, even during this pandemic.

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

Our most important external stakeholders are our PTA Board members. They have continued to meet regularly and support our school through their personal efforts and fundraising. Additionally, we are surrounded by a neighborhood full of Chiles supporters. They are our crime watch, our traffic monitors, and they generally keep an eye on our school and our students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00