Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

1721 N MACDILL AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Denyse Rive IR O   Start Date for this Principal: 1/2/2006

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)	45%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (68%)
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

Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

1721 N MACDILL AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[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	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

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.

We cultivate in each student the desire to grow in wisdom, to nurture an open and curious mind, and to serve others with a generous spirit.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to create an advanced elementary program where students become aware of the shared humanity that binds all people together and develop respect for the variety of cultures and attitudes that add to the richness of life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Riveiro, Denyse	Principal	Instructional leader to oversee instruction, physical plant, and faculty and staff effectiveness.
Van Hise, Jake	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader, behavior management, assessment coordinator, and logistics manager.
Hartle, Angela	Magnet Coordinator	IB Curriculum specialist to oversee delivery of magnet theme. COordinator of schoolwinde events, field trips, guest speakers. Marketing manager.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/2/2006, Denyse Rive IR O

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

383

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

1

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	71	69	68	62	57	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	388
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	1	0	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

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	66	70	57	53	58	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	70	57	53	58	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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%	79%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	55%	58%	62%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	50%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				84%	54%	63%	86%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				78%	57%	62%	74%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	46%	51%	65%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				84%	50%	53%	69%	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	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	55%	27%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	84%	57%	27%	64%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	91%	54%	37%	60%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	84%	51%	33%	53%	31%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-5 ELA and Math % Proficient = iReady data
Gr 5 Science Average % Correct = district baseline assessment (fall), district midyear science assessment (winter), FSA science assessment % proficient (spring)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	64%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	50%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	40%	60%
	English Language Learners	13%	44%	69%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	60%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	51%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	60%	60%
	English Language Learners	7%	19%	38%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67%	91%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	85%	91%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	57%	100%	100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49%	74%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	55%	76%
	Students With Disabilities	77%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	29%	86%	100%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77%	88%	94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	69%	79%	90%
	Students With Disabilities	86%	91%	90%
	English Language Learners	40%	60%	60%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	58%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	41%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	62%	71%	85%
	English Language Learners	20%	20%	60%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	59%	65%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60%	60%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	74%	89%	89%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	61%	59%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70%	61%	78%
	Students With Disabilities	75%	75%	86%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	62%	68%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	46%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	93%	89%	97%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	64%	75%	85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	52%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	89%	93%	97%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	63%	70%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	62%	0
	Students With Disabilities	70%	78%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	46			46							
ELL	54	60		77	90						
ASN	87	100		96	100		100				
BLK	59			59							
HSP	68	50		70	72		65				
MUL	70			100							
WHT	95	64		88	93		100				
FRL	62	41	20	63	58	45	56				

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	73			73							
ELL	73	68		77	74						
ASN	90	58		98	84		80				
BLK	77	73		61	67						
HSP	71	60	57	73	64	45	71				
WHT	88	69		91	86	82	95				
FRL	75	64	59	72	68	54	80				

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
ELL	53	35	30	77	71						
ASN	94	76		100	95						
BLK	68	69		68	54						
HSP	66	55	47	76	66	60	61				
WHT	84	54		92	83		89				
FRL	60	53	50	71	64	47	55				

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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	72
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	97
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	59
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	66
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	85
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	88
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	52
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 overall trend in our iReady data shows a consistent increase in proficiency from fall to spring in all grade levels and across all subject areas.

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

Gains of the bottom quartile students in ELA dropped to 43% in 2021 from 47% in 2019. The percentage of level 2's on FSA increased from 2019-2021 while the percentage of proficient Level 1 students decreased.

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

Rigor in the curriculum needs to be strengthened in order to ensure equitable learning for not only the bottom quartile students, but our level 2 students and above.

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

The data component with the most improvement was overall students making learning gains in math.

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

Our school implemented a reteach math focus lab in the mornings before school. Identified students were invited to the math lab for reteach enrichment. Small groups were better utilized in the classroom in order to scaffold instruction based on student need.

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

All students will be given access to grade level tasks in all subject areas. Teachers will scaffold instruction based on formative assessment data in order to ensure student sucess with grade level tasks.

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 provided in using formative assessment data in instruction and to equitable scaffolds for all levels of students. PD will also be provided to teachers on how to appropriately accelerate learning specific to each content area.

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

With the addition of a guidance counselor to our school this year, teachers will be supported in the MTSS process and managing implementation of strategies and progress monitoring for students in need of extra support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Gains of bottom quartile students in ELA dropped to 43% in 2021 from 47% in 2019. The percentage of ELA level 2's on FSA increased from 2019-2021 while the percentage of level 1 students decreased. We recognize a need for equitable instruction and acceleration for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	An increase in the number of level 2 students who show gains in ELA.
Monitoring:	Level 2 students will be identified early in the year and monitored through the use of a variety of assessments (iReady, district baseline and mid-year assessments, running records etc.) to monitor growth. In addition, participation in Extended Learning Program (ELP) will be monitored for these students. Walthroughs will be used by the principal and assistant principal to ensure support of targeted students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted ELP and reteach small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the accelerated model of on-grade level instruction, teachers have been trained in scaffold activities and use of multiple assessment checkpoints towards a learning outcome.

Action Steps to Implement	
Identify level 2 ELA students and their stretch goals.	
Person Responsible	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Secure an ELP teacher to provide extended learning support.	
Person Responsible	Denyse Riveiro (denyse.riveiro@hcps.net)
During report card meetings and MTSS meetings, identify small group strategies and classroom practices to be used at each grade level.	
Person Responsible	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Monitor iReady data, classroom walkthrough observations, and teacher anecdotal data for learning gains of targeteed students.	
Person Responsible	Denyse Riveiro (denyse.riveiro@hcps.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Results of the TELL survey and teacher evaluation feedback indicate that teachers are interested in more targeted feedback and follow-up leading to improved student outcomes.
Measurable Outcome:	Increased written, targeted, timely feedback compared to last year.
Monitoring:	Increased percentage of teachers on the TELL survey who feel they have received adequate feedback. Increased number of recorded feedback entries in our school OneNote notebook. Increased amount of walkthroughs throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denyse Riveiro (denyse.riveiro@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Create a calendar of scheduled walkthroughs. Complete formal, written feedback for specific teachers in school's OneNote notebook. Monthly goal meetings with principal for each teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	OneNote notebook entries allows teachers instant access to feedback from walkthroughs and goal setting meetings. The entries are accessible by the principal, assistant principal and the teacher in real-time.

Action Steps to Implement

Set up OneNote notebook with private sections for each teacher.

Person Responsible	Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

Create a calendar of scheduled classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible	Denyse Riveiro (denyse.riveiro@hcps.net)

Conduct the walkthroughs using instructional priority look-for's and individual teacher professional learning plan.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Record walkthrough feedback in teacher section of OneNote.

Person Responsible	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Meet monthly with teachers to provide support and feedback on goals and focus on evidence of instructional priorities.

Person Responsible	Denyse Riveiro (denyse.riveiro@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data from the Student Insight Survey demonstrated increased anxiety among students regarding performance in school and self control.
Measurable Outcome:	A decrease in the number of students expressing anxiety on the Student Insight Survey.
Monitoring:	Monitor number the number of students referred to guidance for anxiety-related concerns.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide social/emotional lessons and support to students and parents.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A student's day is filled with strong academic instruction, leaving little time for social/emotional support. Targeting social/emotional activities for both students and parents will support families in reducing anxiety.

Action Steps to Implement

Guidance counselor will conduct a parent seminar on supporting social/emotional learning at home.

Person Responsible	Denyse Riveiro (denyse.riveiro@hcps.net)

PTA and the school will further promote the Inner Explorer program purchased for the school.

Person Responsible	Denyse Riveiro (denyse.riveiro@hcps.net)

Teachers will use Inner Explorer on a regular basis in the classroom to reduce anxiety.

Person Responsible	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

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.

Macfarlane did not have any reportable discipline incidences for the 2020-2021 school year. Discipline data will continue to be monitored for an increase in incidences or a perceived change in culture and environment.

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.

Our character education program sets the tone for building a positive school culture and environment at Macfarlane Park. The IB Learner Profile Traits that make up our character education program are: caring, thinker, risk-taker, open-minded, reflective, communicator, inquirer, knowledgeable, principled and balanced. Students identify these traits in literary characters, historical figures, and leaders of today. They also celebrate the traits in each other. Each month, students are recognized by their classmates for exhibiting the learner profile traits.

In addition to using the learner profile traits to address equity among our students, we also celebrate the great diversity of our student population. Our IB units of inquiry are designed to allow opportunities to make global connections and for students to share their own cultural connections.

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

All stakeholders in the Macfarlane Park family play a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment. We have a very robust parent association who supports students through volunteering, event planning and funding teacher grants for student projects. Our administration and staff facilitate student participation in mindfulness activities in the classroom and schoolwide events. Our students treat each other and our school community with respect as they perform multiple acts of service throughout the year, not only as a class or a grade level, but also as individual students who see a need that they can address.

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
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0060 - Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School			$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

			Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0060 - Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School			$0.00
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0060 - Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School			$0.00
					Total:	**$0.00**