

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Maniscalco K 8 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	21
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Maniscalco K 8 School

939 DEBUEL RD, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Reale

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	83%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (70%)
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	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Maniscalco K 8 School

939 DEBUEL RD, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>54%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>60%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Maniscalco will provide a nurturing and safe learning environment to develop lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Maniscalco will rank in the top 10% of Hillsborough Elementary and Middle Schools.

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
Reale, Tammy	Principal	Oversees the daily activities and operations of the school, Professional Development, Student Behavior, Curriculum Development, MTSS, School-Wide Data
Webster, Coddie	Assistant Principal	Oversees the daily activities and operations of the school, Professional Development, Student Behavior, Curriculum Development, MTSS, School-Wide Data
Fischer, Bilee	School Counselor	Student support, MTSS, CST, 504 plans, school behavior plan, and mental health
Hosea, Micheal	Assistant Principal	Oversees the daily activities and operations of the school, Professional Development, Student Behavior, Curriculum Development, MTSS, School-Wide Data
Hall, Katie	SAC Member	SAC Meetings, SIP, Waivers
Wonderley, Marni	School Counselor	Student support, MTSS, CST, 504 plans, school behavior plan, and mental health

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/20/2021, Tammy Reale

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

6

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Total number of students enrolled at the school

658

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.

2

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	61	78	91	74	81	89	66	53	62	0	0	0	0	655
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	12	9	3	9	5	10	10	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	15	6	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	14	15	12	6	12	9	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	1	0	0	1	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	6	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	76	90	76	80	91	37	25	38	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	5	11	11	8	6	12	12	11	10	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	21	9	11	4	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	15	6	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	76	90	76	80	91	37	25	38	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	5	11	11	8	6	12	12	11	10	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	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	6	21	9	11	4	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	15	6	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	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				60%	57%	61%	57%	59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	56%	59%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	52%	54%	48%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				65%	55%	62%	68%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains				62%	57%	59%	61%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	49%	52%	46%	47%	52%
Science Achievement				54%	50%	56%	69%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					77%	78%		79%	77%

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	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2021					
	2019	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
06	2021					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	56%	51%	5%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades K-2 used iReady

Grades 3-5 used iReady, Achieve 3000, and District Assessments

Grades 6-8 used Achieve 3000 and District Assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42%	59%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	54%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	14%	36%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45%	60%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	44%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	50%	70%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58%	65%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	60%	83%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	63%	74%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32%	59%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	45%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	41%	50%	70%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14%	14%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	57%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	77%	94%	88%
	English Language Learners	14%	14%	29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51%	77%	94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	46%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	47%	69%	84%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73%	84%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66%	65%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	48%	52%	76%
	English Language Learners	29%	43%	29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58%	70%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	46%	81%
	Students With Disabilities	30%	43%	65%
	English Language Learners	40%	80%	60%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78%	79%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	60%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	49%	62%	60%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39%	51%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	35%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	30%	37%	59%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	67.8%		69.80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.40%		48.89%
	Students With Disabilities	55.25%		44.66%
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%	24%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	13%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	58%	58%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	74.55%		57.99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49.60%		58.33%
	Students With Disabilities	80.10%		58.65%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%	26%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	22%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	40%	40%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	62.90%		58.22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41.50%		62.60%
	Students With Disabilities	40.30%		63.65%
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	52.25%		62.82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48.70%		44.09%
	Students With Disabilities	37.30%		37.18%
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	47%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	42%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	50%	50%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52.80		
	Economically Disadvantaged	87.55		
	Students With Disabilities	45.30		
	English Language Learners	N/A		N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	63.60%		52.60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58.60%		49.43%
	Students With Disabilities	60.35%		37.25%
	English Language Learners	32.20%		32.19%

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	24	37	39	39	42	38	10	17			
ELL	43	58	78	50	51	47	27				
ASN	71	60		79	60						
BLK	55	48	54	45	41	27	42				
HSP	54	62	65	59	45	44	51	57	82		
MUL	59	46		64	23						
WHT	65	54	45	65	51	42	51	60	78		
FRL	52	53	56	51	42	38	44	58	79		
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	25	40	43	33	61	63	11				
ELL	46	72	92	59	81	83					

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	75			83							
BLK	42	67		46	57						
HSP	58	64	62	60	64	60	53				
MUL	60			67							
WHT	64	65	68	71	62	62	55				
FRL	58	63	65	59	61	60	52				
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	13	28	28	33	40	40	10				
ELL	48	63		64	56						
BLK	44	71		46	57						
HSP	55	50	45	67	56	50	61				
WHT	62	60	50	72	64	43	75				
FRL	54	59	52	65	59	45	59				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	68
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	45
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	57
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	48
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	57
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	53
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?

Across grade levels the economically disadvantaged and the students with disabilities showed a lower level of proficiency compared to the overall grade levels in most academic areas according to the progress monitoring data for 2020. There is a decrease in overall proficiency for sixth grade and seventh grade math throughout the school year according to the progress monitoring data for 2020. There is a decrease in overall proficiency for eighth grade science throughout the school year according to the progress monitoring data for 2020. There is a decrease in proficiency for economically disadvantaged civics students throughout the school year according to the progress monitoring data for 2020.

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

First grade students with disabilities declined by 7% in reading according to progress monitoring data for the 2020 school year. Fifth grade math showed the greatest decline of 11% according to the 2019 state assessment. Fifth grade students with disabilities declined by 10.59% according to the progress monitoring data for 2020. Eighth grade science showed an 11% decline according to the 2020 progress monitoring data.

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

Lack of foundational skills and loss of instruction due to the pandemic were contributing factors in the areas that need improvement. Intense skill, acceleration, and instructional based small groups need to be implemented to address these needs for improvement.

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

Fourth grade ELA showed the most improvement with a 4% increase according to the 2019 state assessment data. Grades first through fifth all showed large increases in proficiency for overall students according to the 2020 progress monitoring data. Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth grade reading showed an increase in proficiency for overall students according to the 2020 progress monitoring data. Civics showed a 10% increase for overall student data according to the 2020 progress monitoring data.

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

Grades K-5 used iReady for specific individual instruction in the areas of reading and math. K-2 utilized SIPPS instruction to increase mastery of phonics. Grades K-5 utilized Brainspring for the students with disabilities that needed individual specific instruction in reading. Grades 3-8 utilized Achieve 3000 for specific instruction in the area of reading. Grades 6-8 utilize Brightfish for specific instructional gaps for below level students.

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

All grade levels will have monthly data monitoring meetings with administration and support staff to address individual student needs. Small group instruction will be utilized daily in all grade levels and academic areas. There will be a focus on district created instructional calendars to meet all curriculum needs.

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.

There will be monthly ILT meetings with instructional leaders from all grade levels where student work will be discussed and strategies implemented for improvement. Grade level data chats and PLCs to identify individual and grade level student needs. Content specific vertical champion meetings with representation from all grade levels to focus on instructional needs. Teacher driven monthly professional development opportunities to provide opportunities for instructional growth.

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

Administrative walkthroughs and feedback to help support teachers meet professional standards. Monthly job embedded professional development opportunities on school site.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our focus is active student engagement strategies across all curriculum during small and whole group instruction. Student achievement will increase when there is a focus to align instruction with standards and differentiation while maintaining student engagement to ensure learning gains for all students.

We need to increase our Federal Index for Subgroups- Students with disabilities above 42%.

Measurable Outcome: We need to increase student performance in the sub group of economically disadvantaged students.

Improve student performance for the Bottom Quartile in all grades and content areas.

Monitoring: Monthly grade level and content specific data meetings with administration and support staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group instruction, differentiated instruction, standard based objectives, standard based lesson plans and instruction, monthly PLCs, collaborative data conversations, AVID strategies implemented in all grade levels, ILT, MTSS, school-wide behavior plan, professional book studies, parent and student curriculum involvement, administrative feedback to instructional staff, technology and resources for instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: School-wide systems that develop teachers and increase student engagement and learning gains for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly PLCs with notes completed by grade level or content specific.

Person Responsible Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Monthly grade level MTSS meetings with support staff and administration.

Person Responsible Micheal Hosea (michael.hosea@hcps.net)

Professional development monthly with sign-in sheets.

Person Responsible Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Student goal conferencing with support from administration and support staff.

Person Responsible Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our focus is on an individual positive student behavior plan that will increase student engagement and academic success.

Measurable Outcome: School-wide incident reports and referrals will decrease by 5% from the 2020-2021 school year. We will decrease the number of suspensions, 2020-2021 school year we had 11 suspensions.

Monitoring: Monthly grade level meetings with administration and support staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: School-wide behavior committee known as Mustang PRIDE, behavior meetings with support staff to included ESE specialist before the implementation of an FBA, AVID strategies implemented in all grade levels, ILT, MTSS, culture literacy, professional book studies, parent and student behavior meetings with guidance and support, administrative feedback to instructional staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Student engagement and academic success will increase when there is an increase in positive student behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

Guidance counselors having classroom visits and behavior relays to review Mustang PRIDE expectations.

Person Responsible Marni Wonderley (marni.wonderley@hcps.net)

Parent and Student behavior agreement completed with homeroom teacher the first week of school.

Person Responsible Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

School wide behavior incentives provided by guidance and classroom teachers.

Person Responsible Bilee Fischer (bilee.fischer@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 FSA scores 47% in Grade 5 scored at proficiency which is at level 3 or higher. This score was due to over 50% of students one or more grade levels below grade level in reading, lack of teacher clarity, and lack of rigor in the ELA instructional block. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include instruction with rigorous tasks at or above grade level complexity level expected for the grade, small group instruction, frequent monitoring of student level in reading ability, and feedback to teachers on rigorous core instruction. These steps will support an improvement in student proficiency on grade 5 FSA ELA in 2022.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of fifth grade students scoring at a 3 or higher on FSA ELA assessment will increase to 55% as measured by progress monitoring tools and the FSA ELA assessment in 2022.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored by grade level data chats, teacher feedback evidence, classroom walk throughs, i-Ready reading progress, ELA mini assessments, and other district monitoring tools in order to prepare for the grade 5 FSA ELA assessment in 2022. The administrative team will aggressively monitor fifth grade performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will work to improve the accuracy and alignment of the daily learning target so that it is standards aligned and grade level appropriate in order to drive instruction to create an environment of rigorous core instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We want to ensure that student learning tasks are aligned to the grade level standards and also analyze if core instruction is rigorous to create productive student struggles.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze Student and grade level data with the school level Instructional Leadership Team

Person Responsible Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Conduct beginning of the data chats to review FSA ELA data and create an action plan for improvement to monitor progress of all subgroups.

Person Responsible Micheal Hosea (michael.hosea@hcps.net)

Conduct ongoing grade level data chats, focused collaborative planning sessions, and classroom walk through feedback to progress monitor

Person Responsible Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@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.

Incident rates we ranked 260 out of 313 combination schools state wide and 20 out of 31 combination schools in Hillsborough County. Suspensions rate ranked 113 out of 313 combination schools state wide, 10 out of 66 combination schools in Hillsborough county, with a suspension rate of 1.5 per 100 students, and total suspensions 11 for the school year. Primary focus will be to decrease disruptive behavior during the 2021-2022 school year through our positive behavior plan.

School leadership will be holding PLC/MTSS meetings every Monday with grade level teachers/ content area and VE teachers. Middle school will also participate in monthly meeting to focus on the needs of students not making adequate progress in specific subject areas. The focus of these meetings will be on our bottom quartile students, VE students and students not making adequate gains. We will look at what specific instructional practices are being utilized and what changes need to be made in order for students to be successful. Teacher will be utilizing Brainspring, iReady, SIPPS, and Brightfish Reading to support students with deficiencies in phonics and gaps in instructional skills for both Reading and Math. Teams will also be planning together, utilizing district instructional guides, and focusing on standards in small group instruction. We will also be discussing and addressing attendance, tardies, and behavior concerns that are affecting student performance.

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.

We will utilize the feedback results from the Insight Survey to work on a positive school culture and environment. Our ILT team will meet monthly and climate and culture will be worked on through this committee. We will continue with the school-wide behavior committee (PRIDE) that we established last year. Changes will be made to school wide professional development to meet the needs of a K-8 school. We will also have Literacy Night, Math/Science Night, local business and restaurant partnerships, Spirit Nights involving the local community, PTSA Newsletters, school-wide weekly parent links, midterm progress reports, volunteers working with students, school website, NEJHS, NJHS, and student council active in the community. Administration will collaborate with the student council on new initiatives throughout the school year.

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

Grade Level Teachers and Team Leaders
 School-wide Administration
 School-wide Support Services Team
 Mustang PRIDE Committee Chairs
 PTSA
 Maniscalco K-8 Student Body
 NEJHS President
 NJHS President
 Student Council Leaders for each Grade Level

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00