

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Colson 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Colson Elementary School

1520 LAKEVIEW AVE, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Black

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2017

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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	22

Colson Elementary School

1520 LAKEVIEW AVE, Seffner, FL 33584

[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	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to build and inspire a mindful community of responsible citizens and engaged life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is empowering students to achieve success.

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
Mendez, Orestes	Principal	The Elementary School Principal will coordinate administrative oversight and plan all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services.
Black, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	Assistant principals deal with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/29/2017, Rebecca Black

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

576

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	87	84	89	113	92	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	561
Attendance below 90 percent	28	22	28	28	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	2	0	3	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	23	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	28	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

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	87	86	114	111	99	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	14	15	11	18	15	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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	0	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	18	36	34	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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	87	86	114	111	99	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	14	15	11	18	15	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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	0	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	18	36	34	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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				53%	52%	57%	47%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	55%	58%	45%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	50%	53%	28%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	54%	63%	52%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	57%	62%	56%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	46%	51%	28%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	50%	53%	46%	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	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	61%	57%	4%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%
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 diagnostic data, science district formative assessment

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	42%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	65%	70%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	45%	50%
	English Language Learners	35%	45%	60%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	45%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	53%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	45%	50%	55%
	English Language Learners	42%	53%	65%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	35%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	42%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	45%	55%	60%
	English Language Learners	30%	37%	50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	40%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	47%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	30%	35%	42%
	English Language Learners	35%	48%	55%
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	27%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	37%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	38%	40%
	English Language Learners	40%	42%	47%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	15%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	30%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	27%	35%
	English Language Learners	35%	42%	45%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11%	14%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	18%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	15%	22%	27%
	English Language Learners	25%	27%	32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	20%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	22%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	32%	37%
	English Language Learners	30%	37%	42%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5%	10%	10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	10%	15%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	15%	18%
	English Language Learners	15%	20%	22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5%	7%	9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	10%	15%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	10%	12%
	English Language Learners	10%	15%	18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	25%	28%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	27%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	22%	27%
	English Language Learners	30%	37%	40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	15	13	10	12	5		10				
ELL	32	44		36	31		13				
BLK	35	50		30	35		13				
HSP	37	39		32	24		27				
MUL	54			50							
WHT	48	29		39	39		33				
FRL	38	38	36	32	29	24	21				
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	35	32	22	44	33	4				
ELL	30	61	90	48	71	70					
BLK	51	54	46	46	57	48	30				
HSP	48	69	64	51	64	45	30				
MUL	50			73							
WHT	60	67	41	68	77	50	63				
FRL	47	59	54	53	64	49	39				
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	12	36	35	25	41	32	15				
ELL	35	33		38	50						
BLK	37	41	35	42	49	35	32				
HSP	39	39	14	52	61	26	49				
WHT	58	49	45	58	53	21	51				
FRL	41	40	27	46	51	25	39				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	33
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	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trends in formative and state data across grade levels indicate marginal drops in proficiency in the primary grades (less than 5%) with more significant drops in the intermediate grades (20%+). The sub groups data reflects similar deficiencies. The ESSA data reveals SWD, Black, ELL, White, and Economically Disadvantaged students scoring below 41% proficiency.

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

The data components demonstrating the greatest need for improvement are: % proficient in Math and ELA, % learning gains in Math and ELA, and bottom quartile gains in Math and ELA.

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

The contributing factors for to this need for improvement were: at least one class per grade conducting learning remotely, excessive absences due to COVID, and teachers needing to instruct departments and content not originally assigned.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was 3rd grade ELA, with a 6% increase from the previous year.

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

The contributing factor to this improvement was the level of continuity and collaboration within the teachers from the grade. The team developed effective collective efficacy while analyzing data, resulting in purposeful, targeted instruction.

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

Implement coaching cycles around teacher clarity of the guiding question and its relation to the daily learning targets. The coach will use the data from learning walks and IR visits to prioritize teachers and then leverage this knowledge to work with the teacher to develop the focus for the coaching. An emphasis on this work will be on teacher understanding of the guiding question and connecting it for the students to the daily learning target. Utilize teacher leaders as models and thought partners during both instruction and planning to help build teacher capacity across the school. Create a demonstration classroom to show teachers across grades 3-5 what the connection between target, task and guiding question could look like. Coach can support teachers by scheduling fishbowl lessons and side by side coaching sessions within this demonstration classrooms and providing a “look for” document to keep them focused on the learning target/task/guiding question alignment.

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.

Facilitate a professional development opportunity for all grade level teachers that includes specific vocabulary routines and strategies that will be used school-wide. These strategies will include making vocabulary visible in the classroom environment and interactive notebooks, teacher use of vocabulary in teaching and questioning and explicit strategies for student use in conversations, activities and writing. Facilitate mini-Professional Development (PD) on the five practices (Higher Order Thinking Accountable Talk) training for grades three-five.

Attend regularly scheduled Drop-In professional development (PD) facilitated by the District Math Team in third, fourth, and fifth grades.

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

Utilize teacher leaders as models and thought partners during both instruction and planning to help build teacher capacity across the school. Create a demonstration classroom to show teachers across grades 3-5 what the connection between target, task and guiding question could look like. Coach can support teachers by scheduling fishbowl lessons and side by side coaching sessions within this demonstration classrooms and providing a “look for” document to keep them focused on the learning target/task/guiding question alignment.

Engage in classroom walkthroughs to observe application of the connections made between instruction, goals of the topic of study, learning targets and daily tasks- how students and teachers are making their thinking visible. Provide feedback to teachers.

Analyze walkthrough data for evidence of connected learning throughout the day and unit. Collaborate to determine plan for next steps for support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Implement a planning structure with ELA grade level teams in grades 3-5 that will allow them to internalize the Guiding Question and use it as a basis for backwards planning. This area was identified as a critical need based on walkthrough data and observations during planning sessions.
Measurable Outcome:	By May, 2022, 50% of students in grades 3-5 will score proficient on the FSA ELA Assessment. 100% of students will make learning gains and 100% of students in the bottom quartile will make gains.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by the literacy coach and administration attending planning sessions. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of lessons discussed during planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the Guiding Unit question and focus standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Backward design helps teachers create courses and units that are focused on the goal (learning) rather than the process (teaching). ... Advocates of backward design would argue that the instructional process should serve the goals; the goals—and the results for students—should not be determined by the process.

Action Steps to Implement

The framework will include the following steps:

- Teachers pre-read all texts and tasks provided within the instructional guide.
- Literacy Coach will communicate prior to planning what texts/task teachers will be planning with during the session.
- Teachers internalize the task by “doing the work” and discussing at planning what knowledge and skills the students will need to have to complete it successfully.
- Based on the internalizing work, teachers will then construct daily learning targets that are text-specific and will contain both the skill and strategy needed for the day.
- To support our students with disabilities, a strategy implemented will be students turn headings into questions using words like what, why, and how. The student should then read to find the correct answer to those questions. Student should highlight the answers to questions formulated from headings.

Person Responsible Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase teacher and student clarity around the alignment of instruction, learning targets, daily tasks, and end of unit performance tasks.
Measurable Outcome:	By May, 2022, 50% of students in grades 3-5 will score proficient on the FSA ELA Assessment. 100% of students will make learning gains and 100% of students in the bottom quartile will make gains.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by the literacy coach and administration attending planning sessions. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of lessons discussed during planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity is more than simply posting student-friendly learning targets. It's also about helping students gauge their own progress through the use of success criteria and intentional and deliberate feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity is a powerful tool for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning. Along the way, teacher clarity reinforces the gradual release of responsibility of learning from the teacher to the students so that students feel ownership of their work.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement coaching cycles around teacher clarity of the guiding question and its relation to the daily learning targets. The coach will use the data from learning walks and IR visits to prioritize teachers and then leverage this knowledge to work with the teacher to develop the focus for the coaching. An emphasis on this work will be on teacher understanding of the guiding question and connecting it for the students to the daily learning target.

Utilize teacher as models during both instruction and planning to help build teacher capacity across the school. Create a demonstration classroom to show teachers across grades 3-5 what the connection between target, task and guiding question could look like. Coach can support teachers by scheduling fishbowl lessons and side by side coaching within this demonstration classrooms and providing a "look for" document to keep them focused on the learning target/task/guiding question alignment.

Person Responsible Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Maximize teacher content knowledge for teaching to strategically drive students' learning towards the intent of the standard. Increase student engagement during math instruction through focused student-to- student discussion and tasks
Measurable Outcome:	By May, 2022, 50% of students in grades 3-5 will score proficient on the FSA Math Assessment. 100% of students will make learning gains and 100% of students in the bottom quartile will make gains.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by the literacy coach and administration attending planning sessions. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of lessons discussed during planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Discussion is important to learning in all disciplines because it helps students process information rather than simply receive it. ... The goal of a discussion is to get students to practice thinking about the course material. Your role becomes that of facilitator.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Discussion is important to learning in all disciplines because it helps students process information rather than simply receive it. Leading a discussion requires skills different from lecturing. The goal of a discussion is to get students to practice thinking about the course material.

Action Steps to Implement

Organize logistics of and advertise a lesson study opportunity that will be available for three intermediate teachers.

Facilitate mini-Professional Development (PD) on the five practices (Higher Order Thinking Accountable Talk) training for grades three-five.

Facilitate a lesson study focused on teacher content knowledge for teaching and the five practices for orchestrating productive mathematical discussions.

Attend regularly scheduled Drop-In professional development (PD) facilitated by the District Math Team in third, fourth, and fifth grades.

Utilize new learning from the lesson study and professional development during planning with math coach in grades three for five.

Solicit teachers in grades three – five to attend the full version of the self-paced Five Practices Training

Person Responsible Orestes Mendez (orestes.mendez@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.

Colson reported 2.6 incidents per 100 students. The majority of these incidents occurred on the bus (80%) followed by the classroom (20%). The CHAMPS behavioral supports committee developed strategies to reduce the number of incidences. These include:

Embed SEL (Social and Emotional Learning) strategies during lessons

Deliver 30 minutes of 7 Mindsets lessons weekly

Incorporate mindfulness strategies (breathing, counting, calm space, communicating emotions in a variety of ways, reflection area

Incorporate morning class meetings regularly to build community

Incorporate CHAMPS language and visuals throughout the lesson

Families and community partners have received this information to put into practice as well.

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.

School staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. We work hard at building positive relationships with our families and community partners. 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 make every effort to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and having parent teacher conferences.

-Conference Nights

-Volunteer Orientation/Recognition -Committee Events-Great American Teach-In -Ongoing community partnerships -Volunteer program

-Open House

-SAC/PTA -Newsletter/Websites/Edsby/Marque -Parent Link/Remind (phone text system)

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

The school leadership team consisting of administration, guidance, social worker, ELL resource, and ESE resource assists in the planning of school events to promote a positive school culture. Community members

include Absolute Auto, Fast Kicks, McDonalds, Chick FilA. Their role consists of donations such as food, cash, and gift cards.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00