

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Corr 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

Corr Elementary School

13020 KINGS LAKE DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kristi Lyn Ricketts

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2017

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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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

Corr Elementary School

13020 KINGS LAKE DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[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	82%

School Grades History

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

Positive Respectful Individuals Demonstrating Excellence

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide an environment in which families, staff, and community actively work together with the students to help all of them realize and reach their full potential.

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
Ricketts, Kristi-Lyn	Principal	To monitor and contribute data and provide suggestions to better improve student learning; provide follow up and feedback to all stakeholders.
Beatty, Danielle	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal with data collection and feedback.
	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/19/2017, Kristi Lyn Ricketts

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.*

5

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

657

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

3

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	83	90	100	122	100	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

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	80	102	125	107	118	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	9	12	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	48	43	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	53	47	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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

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

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	80	102	125	107	118	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	18	16	28	29	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	48	43	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	53	47	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				42%	52%	57%	45%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	55%	58%	50%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	50%	53%	40%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	54%	63%	46%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	57%	62%	58%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	46%	51%	36%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	50%	53%	48%	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	36%	52%	-16%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We are using iReady data to compile the data below for Reading and Math. For Science, we used our district formative assessment data.

Grade 1					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		20%	36%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged		19%	36%	48%
	Students With Disabilities		15%	30%	35%
	English Language Learners		27%	25%	28%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		19%	28%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged		11%	18%	35%
	Students With Disabilities		10%	25%	35%
	English Language Learners		13%	22%	31%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%	31%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	32%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	5%
	English Language Learners	0%	12%	31%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12%	25%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	20%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	5%
	English Language Learners	3%	3%	23%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31%	46%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	45%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	16%	31%
	English Language Learners	4%	10%	27%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%	27%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	21%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	16%	20%
	English Language Learners	4%	7%	24%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25%	28%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	26%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	3%	6%
	English Language Learners	0%	3%	6%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27%	35%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	28%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	16%	16%
	English Language Learners	15%	7%	21%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23%	28%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	25%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	4%	4%
	English Language Learners	0%	10%	9%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23%	30%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	25%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	13%	17%
	English Language Learners	11%	0%	18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	36%	55%	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	19%	28%	N/A
	English Language Learners	27%	34%	N/A

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	14	33	38	22	33	25	29				
ELL	20	52		36	57	62	38				
BLK	29	52		36	34		38				
HSP	27	43	36	34	49	44	41				
MUL	56			50							
WHT	55	57		53	67		57				
FRL	32	48	38	37	45	43	41				
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	17	35	42	22	38	39	21				
ELL	27	43	40	29	51	52	22				
BLK	31	43	53	25	40	24	32				
HSP	38	50	42	37	49	48	36				
MUL	45	43		60	79						
WHT	59	58	55	65	62		71				
FRL	38	51	49	37	50	41	41				
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	25	44	38	29	50	48	44				
ELL	26	43	41	32	50	39	33				
BLK	39	42	21	29	52	36	38				
HSP	43	53	52	48	60	33	53				
MUL	56	50		61	40						
WHT	56	54		58	65	42	50				
FRL	41	49	39	40	54	38	45				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	38
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	40
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	53
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	58
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	41
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?

Looking at the 2020-2021 FSA data, our school showed a decrease in ELA (7 pts) and Math (3 pts) proficiency. Our ELA Gains stayed the same, but our BQ in ELA decrease 8 pts. Our Math Gains dropped 4 pts., but our Math BQ increased 6 pts.

Looking at our iReady data for both Reading and Math from 19/20 and 20/21, we noticed a decrease in both areas across all grade levels. In Reading, the number of students in red increased from 18% to 27%; the number of students in yellow decreased from 39% to 36%; and the number of students in green also decreased from 43% to 37%. The biggest decrease was in the area of comprehension of informational text from 43% to 36%. In Math, the number of students in red increased from 11% to 24%; the number of students in yellow decreased from 51% to 50%; and the number of students in green dropped from 38% to 26%. Algebraic thinking had the largest decrease from 49% to 36%. Math showed a more significant decrease than reading. However, both areas show a need for improvement.

Our ESSA subgroup data on the 2018-2019 FSA showed the following subgroups did not meet the 41% threshold: SWD (33%), ELL (39%), and our Black/African American students (35%)

We have also had a decrease in student attendance, which can contribute to the decrease in academic performance.

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

Math and Reading demonstrate the greatest needs for improvements.
Attendance needs to be increased.

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

We feel that the pandemic played a large part of our decrease in on level data, due to a lack of providing foundation skills and targeted small group instruction. We are going to target students that are in the greatest need of having learning gaps filled in. Reading endorsed daytime tutors will be utilized to help provide targeted small group instruction, as will our Academic Coaches. There will be a need for more focused PLCs and collaborative planning. More job embedded PD for collaborative planning and an Assistant teacher will be used to support instruction. Students will also be provided with more engaging print, such as Time for Kids.

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

Our formative Science data shows the most improvement from the beginning of the 20-21 year to the end.

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

Our 5th grade math and science teachers collaborated with our 5th grade ELA teachers in coordinating instruction that targeted both reading and science skills. The teachers also strategically did a spiral review by implementing long term investigations using prior year standards. They also incorporated a Nature of Science question as bell work.

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

We will continue to push all of our our learners. We will utilize our Assistant Teacher to pull students needing that extra push.

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.

Teachers will have an opportunity for learning walks, coaching cycles, and PD on Collaborative Planning.

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

A data team is being created, consisting of classroom teachers, academic coaches, and administration to identify students and teachers needing additional support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our school will use collaborative planning with data to plan meaningful, differentiated small group lessons to increase student achievement. It was identified that as a school during our PLC and planning times, we focused too much on planning for whole group instruction and not enough time was spent on planning for targeted small group instruction. It was discussed that teachers may not have been familiar with the curriculum and needed additional support when planning differentiated lessons to fill in learning gaps or accelerate learning. Our data reflected that students had gaps in learning from the prior school year due to school being closed because of the pandemic.

In addition, our ESSA subgroup data showed the following subgroups did not meet the 41% threshold in 2019: Students with Disabilities (33%), ELL (39%), and Black/African American students (35%). All of the action steps as documented below, will positively impact students within these ESSA categories.

Measurable Outcome: We would like to see a 10 point increase in FSA ELA and Math Learning Gains by Spring 2022 along with an increase of 15% in our on level performance on iReady Math and Reading Spring diagnostic in 2022.

Monitoring: We will use data collected from PLC logs, learning walks, FSA, and district assessment data to monitor the progress of our students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristi-Lyn Ricketts (kristi-lyn.ricketts@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will hire a Math Resource teacher and a Reading Coach to review data, assist with planning targeted small group instruction, model best practices and assist with small group instruction. They will also work with administration in conducting student data chats. We will also hire a Teacher’s Assistant to provide targeted small group instruction to help fill in learning gaps. The school will also use Brain Pop to incorporate mini video clips of academic instruction into their lessons. Substitutes will be provided for job embedded PD, such as learning walks and targeted data chats.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We will hire academic coaches to model lessons, assist with small group planning, work with small groups of students, and assist with providing job embedded PD. They will also assist administration with conducting individual student data chats. According to the article, Eight factors for realizing better classroom teaching through support, feedback and intensive, individualized professional learning, “Coaches often employ collaborative conversations (sometimes referred to as conferences), model lessons, observations, and mutual problem solving to assist teachers in implementing and mastering new teaching practices.” Hiring a Teacher’s Assistant to pull small groups to target foundation skills and accelerate learning is essential. According to the article, The Power of Small Group Instruction, “students benefit from exposure to multiple teachers and opportunities for learning. It provides time to reinforce subject matter in various ways. Therefore, it is a worthwhile practice in literacy, mathematics, social studies, science, art projects and community-based projects.” The purchasing of Brain Pop will positively impact learning. According to the research, The Effects of Animation Online Learning, “The findings showed a significant impact of an animation-based on-line learning environment on transfer of knowledge and on learning motivation.” Job embedded PD will be used to strengthen teacher disposition for being a member of a professional learning community that examines practice and learns together. According to the research, Job-Embedded Professional Learning Essential to improving Teaching and Learning in Early Education, teachers that

participated in job embedded PD, “described how much they learned from their colleagues in their team lesson planning meetings and during the reflective practice groups. According to the article, “Learning Communities: Professional Learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within the learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment,” professional learning within communities requires continuous improvement, promotes collective responsibility, and supports alignment of individual, team, school, and school system goals. Learning communities convene regularly and frequently during the workday to engage in collaborative professional learning to strengthen their practice and increase student results. Learning community members are accountable to one another to achieve the shared goals of the school and school system and work in transparent, authentic settings that support their improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

We will hire an Assistant Teacher and utilize daytime tutors to provide additional, targeted support to students identified by our data team to help fill in learning gaps. Our focus will be on our black and ELL subgroups. This will be monitored by assessment data and weekly meetings with administration beginning August 2021-June 2022.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Hire a Reading and Math Coach-They will be responsible for providing: ongoing needs based Professional Development, at least weekly planning with teachers, coaching cycles, as needed, on best practices of Math and Reading strategies and pedagogy, ongoing data analysis, weekly Professional Learning Communities, and supporting students, as needed. This will be monitored by coaching logs and weekly meetings with administration beginning August 2021-June 2022.

Person Responsible Kristi-Lyn Ricketts (kristi-lyn.ricketts@hcps.net)

Hire a Teacher’s Assistant and daytime tutors-They will be responsible for working with small groups of students requiring additional interventions, as determined by our Data Team. Our focus will be on our black and ELL subgroups. This will be monitored by assessment data and weekly meetings with administration beginning August 2021-June 2022.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Purchase Time for Kids Subscription - TFK provides interesting Informational text to use during small group instruction including our SWD from Aug 2021-June 2022. Admin and teachers will monitor use through walkthroughs, lesson plans, or PLC logs.

Person Responsible Kristi-Lyn Ricketts (kristi-lyn.ricketts@hcps.net)

Purchase Brain Pop - Brain Pop can be implemented weekly in all content area lessons to engage students in learning beginning August 2021-June 2022. It will be monitored through walkthrough data, PLC logs, or lesson plans by teachers and admin.

Person Responsible Kristi-Lyn Ricketts (kristi-lyn.ricketts@hcps.net)

Plan PD for August on What is Collaborative Planning? A training will be provided to the staff by the leadership team and/or a district trainer in August 2021 (and possibly ongoing throughout the year). PLC logs will be turned in by team leaders for verification of collaborative planning.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 30% of 3rd graders, 28% of 4th, and 46% of 5th graders scored at proficiency, which is Level 3 or higher. This score was due to students having multiple changes in learning modes due to COVID and lack of targeted small group instruction. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include more collaborative planning using student data to differentiate small group instruction resulting in an improvement in student proficiency of the 2022 ELA FSA.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of students in Grades 3, 4, and 5 scoring at a Level 3 or higher on the 2022 FSA will increase to at least 50% proficiency.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored by monthly ELA assessment data, walk-through data, and district formative data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristi-Lyn Ricketts (kristi-lyn.ricketts@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our Reading Coach and district DRTs will provide on going coaching and assistance throughout the school year. They will help facilitate planning sessions based on needs identified through assessment data and walk-throughs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In 2021, the data showed a need for additional support in ELA. The improvement strategy focusing on collaborative planning using data to plan for targeted, small group instruction will ensure our students are getting the support they need, resulting in improved student academic performance in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the Guiding Unit question and focus standards.

Person Responsible Angela Seiferd (angela.seiferd@hcps.net)

Administration should plan to attend weekly planning sessions and conduct walkthroughs to collect evidence of look-fors and lesson implementation. Provide feedback to teachers based on observations.

Person Responsible Bradley Fuller (bradley.fuller@hcps.net)

Communicate strengths and opportunities with district support to implement the next cycle of support

Person Responsible Kristi-Lyn Ricketts (kristi-lyn.ricketts@hcps.net)

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.

Person Responsible Angela Seiferd (angela.seiferd@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.

According to Safe Schools for Alex, Corr reported 0.3 incidents per 100 students. It is less than the statewide average of 1.0. When compared to all elementary schools in the state, Corr falls in the LOW category. Statewide we are ranked #420 out of 1,395 elementary schools and #26 out of 119 in the county. We have had no property or drug/public order incidents. However, in 2019-2020, we did have 2 violent incidents: a physical attack and threat/intimidation, putting Corr in the moderate range at a rate per 100 students of 0.28. We are also in the moderate range with 12 suspensions. Administration and the Social Services team will meet weekly to review behavior and discipline data. We will hold monthly behavior drop in sessions for teachers needing assistance with students that have behavior challenges and will adapt the frequency of the meetings as needed. We will also hold school-wide meetings monthly to teach and encourage positive behaviors and SEL needs.

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.

Administration will use parent, staff, and student survey data to reflect, revise, and revisit our policies and procedures. We have several stakeholder committees such as SAC, PTA, NEHS, behavior, ILT, and steering that meet regularly to discuss climate and culture and ways to improve. Throughout the year we will conduct additional surveys to progress monitor. This will allow us to implement or change policies, as needed.

This school year, we will implement a House Behavior System. Students and staff will be sorted into 1 of 5 houses across grade levels. This will help build a sense of community, not only in the classroom, but across the grade level and school. Points will be awarded for: arriving to school on time each day, which will hopefully impact attendance; for demonstrating a behavior that reflects PRIDE (Perseverance, Respect/Responsibility, Integrity, Determination, and Empathy). Points will be updated and shared daily and all staff members will have the opportunity to give points. House celebrations will be done monthly and quarterly by administration.

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

We have a business partnership with a local church that provides for our neediest families on a weekly basis and helps provide toys and clothing during the holidays. We are continuing our partnership with the Conn Foundation, the YMCA, and a local private VPK provider to strengthen our our Pre-K to Kindergarten program.

Some activities that promote a positive culture and environment and encompass all stakeholders (staff, students, families, and community partners) to be involved are:
 Parent Family Nights such as, Math Night at Publix, Reading Night, ELL, Title I, FSA information sessions, Kindergarten Night, and ESE Parent Night.
 PTA dances, Spring Fling, and Bingo Night
 Chorus Performance
 Award Assembly
 Kindergarten Round Up
 Terrific Kid
 Quarterly student recognition for behavior and academics (Principal Honor Roll)
 School-wide pep rallies
 Veteran's Day program
 Great America Teach In
 Family Friday Breakfast
 Conference Nights

Part V: Budget

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

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