Clair Mel Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Clair Mel Elementary School

1025 S 78TH ST, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gloria Waite

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2017

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: C (46%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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.](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

Clair Mel Elementary School

1025 S 78TH ST, Tampa, FL 33619

[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	98%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

School Grades History

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

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.

At Clair-Mel Elementary, we encourage success in our school and throughout the community by establishing a climate of collaboration based upon shared goals and expectations.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Clair-Mel Elementary, we are developing successful, productive citizens who make positive differences.

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
Waite, Gloria	Principal	The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County. HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the Hillsborough - 0841 - Clair Mel Elementary School - 2020-21 SIP

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Last Modified: 6/23/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 6 of 19 Name Title Job Duties and Responsibilities past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement. Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact. Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.
Lamphere, Melanie	SAC Member	The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County. HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the Hillsborough - 0841 - Clair Mel Elementary School - 2020-21 SIP Last Modified: 6/23/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 6 of 19 Name Title Job Duties and Responsibilities past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement. Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact. Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/25/2017, Gloria Waite

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

351

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

6

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

6

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	12	63	64	94	52	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	22	22	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	20	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	35	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/23/2021

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	61	67	95	65	77	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	449
Attendance below 90 percent	16	17	19	13	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	4	223	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	20	48	35	13	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
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	61	67	95	65	77	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	449
Attendance below 90 percent	16	17	19	13	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	4	223	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	20	48	35	13	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
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				44%	52%	57%	40%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	55%	58%	35%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	50%	53%	31%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				36%	54%	63%	37%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				42%	57%	62%	39%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	46%	51%	35%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				25%	50%	53%	36%	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	41%	52%	-11%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	55%	-13%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	31%	57%	-26%	64%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	54%	-27%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	25%	51%	-26%	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.

I-Ready data for Reading and Math diagnostics were used for all grade levels. i-Ready progress monitoring assessments were also used from i-Ready in addition to the district math monthlies. Science data was monitored through baseline and mid-year assessments provided by the district.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	8%	5%	19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	5%	15%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	0%	10%
	English Language Learners	4%	8%	10%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	9%	0%	15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	0%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	0%	15%
	English Language Learners	19%	0%	7%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	14%	14%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	14%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	3%	13%
	English Language Learners	12%	10%	20%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	11%	12%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	12%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	10%	23%
	English Language Learners	13%	12%	29%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	23%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	23%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	0%	11%
	English Language Learners	3%	6%	24%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1%	6%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1%	6%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	17%
	English Language Learners	0%	6%	11%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12%	15%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	15%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	3%	3%
	English Language Learners	4%	4%	7%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	11%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	11%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	3%	6%	6%
	English Language Learners	17%	12%	15%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11%	11%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	11%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	5%	0%	16%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12%	16%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	16%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	5%	8%
	English Language Learners	5%	11%	32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	43.24%	48.24%	54.39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.13%	47.12%	53.98%
	Students With Disabilities	36.36%	44.41%	46.27%
	English Language Learners	46.67%	42.98%	47.54%

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			44							
ELL	22	44		43	58		17				
BLK	32	33		43	55		5				
HSP	40	51		47	47		29				
WHT	33			57							
FRL	36	44	60	46	49	63	22				
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	7	26	42	3	30		9				
ELL	42	68	75	32	41	50	27				
BLK	31	51	53	28	35	50	17				
HSP	50	61	67	36	41	60	25				

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
MUL	62			54							
WHT	63	62		56	54						
FRL	44	56	63	37	41	53	25				
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	15	18	10	24	38						
ELL	27	25	20	22	31	38	25				
BLK	32	38	40	34	42	35	24				
HSP	41	30	24	38	36	37	48				
WHT	52	53		37	46						
FRL	40	36	31	37	39	36	35				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
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	46
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
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	45
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?

The percentage of students scoring proficient on the FSA math assessment has been historically low. In 2021, 47% of our students scored a Level 3 or above showing an increase of 11%. Forty-eight percent of our students showed gains in math compared to and 42% in 2019 and 63% of our bottom quartile showed gains, compared to 55% in 2019. There were 36% of students scoring Level 3 or higher in 2019 and 37% scoring Level 3 or higher in 2018. Our students with disabilities and Black/African American ESSA subgroups both fall below the 41% threshold with SWD performing the lowest at 23%. We have had inconsistencies in our ESE instructional units which impacts the implementation of best practices to complement the work in the regular education classroom. The percentage of students scoring proficient on the NGSS Science has decreased from 36% to 25%, however, the formative data has shown a positive trend with an average of 40% or more.

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

Science scores had the greatest decline with a drop form 35 to 26% proficient from 2018-19, but the formative data from 2020 and 2021 shows 40% or more of students are performing at the proficient level. Math achievement levels remained relatively the same in 2018 and 2019 at 37% to 36% respectively. Math proficiency continues to be of concern as we are not teaching to the depth of the standard and building conceptual understanding where students are then able to transfer skills learned. When reviewing mid-year i-Ready data, the percent of students scoring 2 or more grade levels below in Math has decreased from 35 to 26% with the percent of students on level increasing from 11-17%. Geometry is currently the lowest ban with only 16% of students on level. In reading, the percentage of students who are scoring on level on i-Ready has increased from 19 to 25%, but the percentage of students scoring 2 or more levels below only decreased from 38% to 32%. Our I-Ready data shows the weakest area in reading to be vocabulary followed by comprehension and phonics. There is a need to focus on foundational schools.

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

Reading and Math data show that students are entering intermediate grades with low scores in phonics/phonemic awareness, basic computation, number sense, and place value. Content is not presented in the primary grades at a level that is building foundational skills. Resources are not used with fidelity to meet the needs of the learners in the primary grades. There is a lack of teacher's knowledge in building foundational skills. There is no systematic school-wide process to ensure mastery of grade-level standards. Although Learning Walks and model lessons were implemented, the follow-up fidelity checks could be increased to move teachers to mastery. With students now in physical classrooms, Learning Walks and coaching cycles would be needed more frequently in order to monitor growth towards mastery.

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

Our reading and writing data has shown the greatest improvement with our bottom 25% gains doubling from 2018 to 2019.
In addition, our math proficiency increased by 11% in 2021.

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

Small groups instruction and a specific focus on phonics to close gaps in foundational skills has helped significantly. Also, a school-wide focus on writing to include PLC calibration from K-5 has helped set clear expectations for writing. There is a need to continue to focus on building foundational skills in the core content areas.

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

More time should be allocated to focus on analyzing student data in a planned PLC with the support of resource personnel, more focus on professional development designed to support formative assessment during instruction and planning in response to data collected with a focus on building a strong foundation in primary and building strong, consistent, differentiated small group instruction across the content areas in intermediate grades. Small group acceleration groups will be needed to pre-teach instruction in core to scaffold background knowledge.

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

Professional development will be presented on the use of the SIPPS phonics program as well as the effective use of math manipulatives in Math lessons. Teachers will work in grade-level teams to analyze student data and the grade-level standards to create common formative assessments that monitor student progress. Also, included in PD will include academic discourse and Webb's DOK levels of questioning.

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

The ILT will continually monitor student data to determine professional development needs. Close attention will be made to primary data to ensure students are mastering the foundational skills that will transfer over into intermediate grades. In addition, foundational gaps will be addressed in intermediate grades quickly and with intentionality in order to then be able to focus on building comprehension.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students scoring proficient on the FSA math assessment has been historically low. There were 36% of students scoring Level 3 or higher in 2019 and 37% scoring Level 3 or higher in 2018. In 2021, the percentage of students scoring proficient on FSA math assessment was 47% gaining 11%. Sixty-three of our lowest quartile of students showed gains. Our students with disabilities and Black/African American ESSA subgroups both fall below the 41% threshold with SWD performing the lowest at 23%. We have had inconsistencies in our ESE instructional units which impacts the implementation of best practices to complement the work in the regular education classroom. The percentage of students scoring proficient on the NGSS Science has decreased from 36% to 23%, however the formative data has shown a positive trend with an average of 40% or more. When reviewing current i-Ready data, the percent of students scoring 2 or more grade levels below in Math has decreased from 35 to 26% with the percent of students on level increasing from 11-17%. Geometry is currently the lowest ban with only 16% of students on level. In reading, the percentage of students who are scoring on level on i-Ready has increased from 19 to 25%, but the percentage of students scoring 2 or more levels below only decreased from 38% to 32%. The highest priority for improvement foundational skills in the primary grades so intermediate may focus on small group instruction. This focus should address not only the entire school population but specifically our SWD who are falling beyond a grade level below to close the learning gaps. According to recent trend data based on classroom walkthroughs and observations, learning tasks designed by teachers do not always meet grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, at least 50% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA and 52% will score a level 3 or higher on the FSA Math assessment. Instructional coaches will offer PLC sessions and grade level planning sessions to increase teacher content knowledge and align student learning tasks to grade level standards.
Monitoring:	i-Ready data will be analyzed throughout the school year along with formative assessment data to track student attainment of goals. In addition, Achieve3000 will be monitored monthly to determine Lexile growth. instructional coaches will capture attendance during PLC sessions and grade level planning session. Teachers will receive at least weekly planning sessions from Instructional Coaches and walkthroughs from Administration. At the conclusion of the walk-through periods, teachers will be given specific feedback on current trends and next steps in relation to their task/question alignment. Teacher monitoring will be based on evidence of planning and implementation of the newly learned strategies from coaching cycles as observed during the classroom walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gloria Waite (gloria.waite@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement coaching to support standards-based planning with fidelity checks to ensure instructional resources are used with fidelity. This will include consistent observation and feedback cycles tied to professional development presented to monitor progress. Professional development will be designed to support the evidence gathered from classroom visits. Data will be analyzed regularly to monitor the plans' effectiveness. School-wide anchor charts will be created to bridge the learning across grade levels in all content areas. Quarterly benchmarks will be created to move students through mastery of phonics in the primary grades so intermediate teachers may focus more on vocabulary development and small group instruction. Fact fluency, number sense, and place value will be the focus in primary so intermediate teachers may focus on grade-level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In the past, PD, modeling, and Learning Walks have been implemented but effective change in teacher instruction has been inconsistent. Supporting and monitoring follow-up through instructional resources will be implemented to focus on instructional priorities.

Action Steps to Implement

The Reading Coach will focus on coaching, modeling and lesson planning with teachers in Grades K-5. The coaching and modeling will occur weekly under the supervision of the school principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of coaching. The Reading Coach will meet weekly with teachers in grades K-5 to plan effective lessons to meet the needs of students in grades K-5. Teacher observation data will be used to measure the effectiveness of the impact of coaching on instructional design and delivery.

Person Responsible Gloria Waite (gloria.waite@hcps.net)

Hire a Math Resource teacher. The Math Resource teacher will focus on coaching, modeling and lesson planning with teachers in Grade K-5. The coaching and modeling will occur weekly under the supervision of the school principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of coaching. The Math Resource will meet weekly with teachers in grades K-5 to plan effectives lessons to meet the needs of students in grades K-5. Teacher observation data will be used to measure the effectiveness of the impact of coaching on instructional design and delivery.

Person Responsible Gloria Waite (gloria.waite@hcps.net)

The Reading Coach, MTSS teacher and/or classroom teacher will focus on using phonics for reading supplemental resources with ESE and African American students in small groups. The small group intervention will be provided to SWD and African American students on a weekly schedule. The teaching and planning will occur weekly under the supervision of the school principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of this intervention. The Reading coach, MTSS teacher and classroom teachers will meet weekly to plan effective lessons to meet the needs of SWD and African American students.

Person Responsible Gloria Waite (gloria.waite@hcps.net)

Preplanning dates will be used to develop school-wide anchor charts and benchmarks for progress monitoring across grade levels so there is a common language school-wide. The team will meet for three days in the summer for planning. The information will be presented during preplanning to the entire staff. The team will revisit the plan to monitor progress and implementation monthly during the year under the supervision of the principal.

Person Responsible Gloria Waite (gloria.waite@hcps.net)

Phonics for Reading books will be used during small group instruction for use with students who are lacking phonics skills in grades 2-5 to close the learning gaps quickly. This resource will be used by the Reading Resource teacher during small group intervention time on a daily basis under the supervision of the principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor the implementation of the resources. This resource will be used to fill in foundational skill gaps so students may reach grade level standards content through support in small group instruction. .

Person Responsible Gloria Waite (gloria.waite@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA proficiency on FSA reading was at 44% in 2019 and dropped to 37% in 2020. There is a need to build foundational skills at all grade levels and to focus on standards based instruction and effective immediate feedback to students as they are engaged in learning tasks. This focus should address not only the entire school population but specifically our SWD who are falling beyond a grade level below to close the learning gaps. According to recent trend data based on classroom walkthroughs and observations, learning tasks designed by teachers do not always meet grade level standards and students are compliant rather than intellectually engaged.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, at least 50% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA. Instructional coaches will offer PLC sessions and grade level planning sessions to increase teacher content knowledge and align student learning tasks to grade level standards.
Monitoring:	i-Ready data will be analyzed throughout the school year along with formative assessment data to track student attainment of goals. In addition, Achieve3000 will be monitored monthly to determine Lexile growth. instructional coaches will capture attendance during PLC sessions and grade level planning session. Teachers will receive at least weekly planning sessions from Instructional Coaches and walkthroughs from Administration. At the conclusion of the walk-through periods, teachers will be given specific feedback on current trends and next steps in relation to their task/question alignment. Teacher monitoring will be based on evidence of planning and implementation of the newly learned strategies from coaching cycles as observed during the classroom walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement standards based weekly planning sessions with coaches to include specific focus areas for aggressive monitoring with the lesson after a deep dive into understanding of the standards. This will include consistent observation and feedback cycles tied to professional development presented to monitor progress. Professional development will be designed to support the evidence gathered from classroom visits. Data will be analyzed regularly to monitor the plans' effectiveness. Quarterly benchmarks will be created to move students through mastery of phonics in small group instruction. Aggressive monitoring trend data will be reviewed and use for planning effective next steps for acceleration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In the past, PD, modeling, and Learning Walks have been implemented but effective change in teacher instruction has been inconsistent. Supporting and monitoring follow-up through instructional resources will be implemented to focus on instructional priorities.

Action Steps to Implement

Phonics for Reading books will be used during small group instruction for use with students who are lacking phonics skills in grades 2-5 to close the learning gaps quickly. This resource will be used by the Reading Resource teacher during small group intervention time on a daily basis under the supervision of the principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor the implementation of the resources. This resource will be used to fill in foundational skill gaps so students may reach grade level standards content through support in small group instruction. .

Person Responsible Gloria Waite (gloria.waite@hcps.net)

Aggressive monitoring training will be provided to staff during preplanning and throughout the school year to support teachers in using this strategy effectively to provide in the moment feedback to students so students are engaged in practicing correctly. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor the implementation of this strategy.

Person Responsible Gloria Waite (gloria.waite@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Clair-Mel Elementary School reported 1.9 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the very high category. Physical attack was documented 11 times. This will be the area of focus to increase SEL lessons as well as behavior supports for students with a pattern of aggressive behavior.

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.

Clair-Mel will continue to implement parent groups, i-Moms and All-Pro Dads which will meet monthly. The SAC committee will also meet monthly to include all stakeholders. During preplanning, our faith-based support group prepared breakfast for Clair-Mel and an additional corporate sponsor, Harvey's Supermarket was announced. Clair-Mel also has a Well-being4U Champion, who encourages self-care, fitness, and well-being. A Wellness Room will be created this year to support teachers' well-being. A new teacher mentor program has been implemented to provide support for new teachers coming to Clair-Mel for sustainability. Prize Patrol (administrative team) visits classrooms to celebrate successes monthly. Students and teachers are celebrated through this program. Feel Good Fridays are Friday afternoon read alouds by the principal on Zoom projected through classrooms to wrap up the week with a read-aloud to promote literacy. Terrific Kids program celebrates students' successes from every classroom with a morning program monthly.

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

Harvey's Supermarket - new corporate sponsor which will help support our school through a "rounding up" program for a specified period of time.

No Greater Love - is a faith-based church which provided faculty a preplanning breakfast and support throughout the year.

Boys and Girls Club-- we have a liaison who partners with Clair Mel teachers and staff to provide additional tutoring for students individually in their after-school program.

Parents--Participate in i-Moms and All Pro Dads monthly to connect with Clair-Mel; also PTA

Teachers--Participate in PTA to connect to other stakeholders

Administration--Weekly recorded phone calls to all stakeholders. Weekly Cougar News provided to teachers about weekly meetings, deadlines, and goals; walkthroughs to be in touch with classrooms

Wellbeing4U champion-support with Go365 app, Weekly Step Challenges, BIometric Screenings, Mammogram Bus Visit, Yoga, C25K running program

Resource/Instructional Coaches: Learning Walks to build positive culture and celebrations; coaching cycles for building ongoing support;

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00