

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mintz 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Mintz Elementary School

1510 HEATHER LAKES BLVD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 5/4/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Mintz Elementary School

1510 HEATHER LAKES BLVD, Brandon, FL 33511

[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	75%
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		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.

To develop leadership potential in all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering Lifelong Leaders

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
Moltisanti, Deborah	Principal	Responsible for planning, coordinating, implementing, and oversight of all school programs
Turbee, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Lighthouse Coordinator - facilitates the school Lighthouse Team
Shoup, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Lighthouse Coordinator - facilitates the school Lighthouse Team
Hays, Sheila	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Empower Learners
Howell, Beth	Instructional Media	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Leadership Environment
Savary, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Adult Learning and Modeling
Nunn, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Teach Students to Lead
Velez, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Shared Leadership
Simmons, Precious	Assistant Principal	Responsible for oversight of curriculum and teacher training
	Teacher, K-12	Leader in Me Action Team Leader - Leadership Environment

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 5/4/2009, Kevin Martin

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

750

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

10

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

13

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	114	125	111	131	125	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	713
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	14	26	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	43	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	15	8	16	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	7	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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

Saturday 8/21/2021

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	115	124	145	127	120	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	9	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	3	5	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	0
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	31	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
--	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	32	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
---	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	1	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

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	115	124	145	127	120	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	9	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	3	5	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	16	31	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	32	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	1	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

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				54%	52%	57%	55%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	55%	58%	55%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	53%	51%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	54%	63%	62%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	57%	62%	64%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	46%	51%	47%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	50%	53%	61%	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	58%	52%	6%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady was used for Reading and Math. District Science assessment was used for Science. The Science data reflected is % correct on the assessment.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31%	53%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	50%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	50%	67%
	English Language Learners	0%	36%	64%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	32%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	28%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	15%	25%	50%
	English Language Learners	0%	27%	36%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24%	56%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	52%	61%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	39%	22%
	English Language Learners	0%	42%	58%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9%	36%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	33%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	35%	41%
	English Language Learners	0%	37%	58%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41%	51%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	49%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	21%	29%
	English Language Learners	24%	35%	42%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8%	26%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	19%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	19%	25%
	English Language Learners	5%	12%	21%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32%	38%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	27%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	34%	33%	41%
	English Language Learners	14%	14%	39%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	24%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	16%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	30%	46%
	English Language Learners	7%	7%	31%

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		28%	36%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged		23%	30%	39%
	Students With Disabilities		37%	31%	39%
	English Language Learners		0%	18%	25%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		23%	35%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged		17%	33%	31%
	Students With Disabilities		26%	37%	56%
	English Language Learners		20%	18%	11%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		45%	55%	
	Economically Disadvantaged		42%	52%	
	Students With Disabilities		45%	55%	
	English Language Learners		38%	47%	
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	33		24	17		30				
ELL	38	38		43	54		14				
BLK	36	17		39	38		44				
HSP	50	44		45	25	10	22				
MUL	57			65							
WHT	52	52		44	29		30				
FRL	42	36	48	40	28	20	27				
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	38	38	34	35	29	19				
ELL	38	48	57	53	60	50	38				
ASN	87			80							

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
BLK	45	53	46	55	56	48	40				
HSP	51	48	47	57	57	52	48				
MUL	71	56		62	69		82				
WHT	57	59	67	71	65	50	71				
FRL	49	51	49	56	56	50	49				
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	27	58	52	45	58	42	38				
ELL	42	54		51	56	60					
BLK	48	55	52	49	56	46	38				
HSP	50	48	42	58	61	37	62				
MUL	62	55		75	86		62				
WHT	65	66	67	74	67	58	73				
FRL	49	52	52	57	61	49	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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	315
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

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	
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	35
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	35
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	61
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	41
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Our lowest performance area in 2018-19 was learning gains of the bottom quartile in ELA. This is also supported by our SWD subgroup, whose data declined by 18% from 2017-18 to 2018-19, making them an ESSA subgroup for the first time. Other trends include a comparatively low percentage of 4th graders who make gain in both ELA and Math, along with a multi-year decline in the percent of 5th graders who make learning gains in ELA and Math. Multiple years of data show in consistent performance in the Bottom Quartile.

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

The decline in the SWD subgroup to become an ESSA subgroup is a concern. In addition, decreasing numbers of students demonstrating learning gains is also cause for concern. This is also reflected in the number of students receiving Tier 2 & 3 interventions.

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

The greatest decline was in our SWD subgroup, who showed a 16% decline from the prior year. One contributing factor could be a reduction in ESE teacher units from 5 to 4, resulting in less flexibility in scheduling for ESE students and less ability to employ the co-teach model.

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

Between 2018 to 2019, our learning gains in Math increased by 4%.

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

The Math Coach introduced several teachers to the Guided Math model of instruction.

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

All students will need consistent expose to on-level material and standards. Pre-assessment of skills and standards prior to units would allow teachers to target instruction to standards/skills needed. Collaborative planning and data analysis will also allow teachers to plan targeted strategies for groups of students and compare their successes based on assessment.

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.

We have increased the number of Teacher Leaders on our campus from 2 to 4, so that both primary and intermediate teachers have access to highly effective teachers to serve as model classrooms, coaches, and mentors. Continued professional development in the 4 Disciplines of Execution will train teachers to involve students in academic goal setting, developing lead measures, and progress monitoring. Ongoing job-embedded PD will be provided to teachers based upon trends seen in administrative walkthroughs. Support from district coaches will be provided for ELA, Math, and Science.

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

Continued implementation of Leader in Me, including coaching and support from LIM Coach, will continue to embed and improve LIM components, both social/emotional and academic, into our school culture.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus In order to meet our students needs in the area of student engagement, we will need to continue to focus on designing instruction that will meet students at their current level and identify practices that will move them toward proficiency. By building a culture for learning in our school, we can:

Description and Rationale: Build pride and ownership in a student's work. Include self-reflection and self-assessment in all work tasks. Teach students to set goals and they give specific feedback in their goal attainment.
 Challenge students to surpass the predetermined goals so they can set new goals.
 Create a voice in each student that will advocate for themselves, especially their learning.

Measurable Outcome: Mintz Elementary will raise its percentage of school grade points from 54% in 2019 to 62% in 2022.

Monitoring: Administrative walkthroughs and observations will assess trends based on schoolwide look-fors, as well as targeted individualized professional development for individual teachers. In addition, progress monitoring data will be reviewed and analyzed for student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will continue to implement the 4 Disciplines of Execution strategies as we set schoolwide, grade level, class, and individual learning goals utilizing the Leader in Me model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Leader in Me initiative is schoolwide and has demonstrated in 6 independent studies to have positive academic impacts as well as improved student behavior. The Leader in Me focuses on leadership for all, including both adults and students taking an active role in goal setting based upon gaps in learning and devising strategies to address the gap using The 4 Disciplines of Execution. It also creates a cadence of accountability in monitoring the achievement of goals, both academic and social.

Action Steps to Implement

Designate 4 teachers in the Teacher Leader role. One pair of Teacher Leaders will support primary and the other intermediate teachers. The Teacher Leaders will serve on the school's Lighthouse Team, which is the leadership team responsible for implementation and monitoring of Leader in Me activities. In addition, the Teacher Leader classrooms will serve as model classrooms. The Teacher Leaders (2 ELA and 2 Math/Science) will coach faculty in effective instructional practices. Coaching and modeling will occur under the direction of administration.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Leader in Me annual membership. Required as an authorized LIM school. Includes 3 coaching calls, principal development track, Lighthouse Coordinator development track, online learning, student & classroom content, Measureable Results Assessment for stakeholder groups, and access to Leader in Me online resources for all teachers and staff members.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Leader in Me Core 2 for Lighthouse Team. Full day training with Lighthouse team to strengthen them in their roles as teachers leaders of their respective teams.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Leader in Me Core 2 Workshop. Full day training to reinforce 7 Habits principles. This training is intended to help staff live the content of the 7 Habits and fully integrate it into their classrooms.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Leader in Me Academics 2 Impact Journey. Full day training to build school academic plan will include deep dive into beginning of year baseline data, plan development, and training to execute.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Regular progress monitoring through iReady, Wonders, and district assessments.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In order to meet our students needs in the area of ELA, we will need to continue to focus on designing instruction that will meet students at their current level and identify practices that will move them toward proficiency. This includes Implementing a planning structure with ELA grade level teams in grades 3-5 that will allow them to collaborate as they plan for instruction across the grade level..
 By building a culture for learning in our school, we can:
 Build pride and ownership in a student's work. Include self-reflection and self-assessment in all work tasks. Teach students to set goals and they give specific feedback in their goal attainment.
 Challenge students to surpass the predetermined goals so they can set new goals.
 Create a voice in each student that will advocate for themselves, especially their learning.

Measurable Outcome: Schoolwide Wildly Important Goal (WIG) - 100% of students at Mintz Elementary will attain their stretch reading goal as measured by iReady Reading by May 2022.
 64% of students will score Level 3 and higher on 2022 FSA ELA.
 63% of students will demonstrate learning gains on 2022 FSA ELA.

Monitoring: We will make use of administrative walkthroughs and monitor data through our electronic database.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Leader in Me
 4 Disciplines of Execution
 Professional Learning Communities
 Standards-Based Instruction
 Collaborative Planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Continued implementation of The Leader in Me, embodying a holistic approach to education, redefining how schools measure success. This approach empowers educators with effective practices and tools to:
 Teach LEADERSHIP to every student,
 Create a CULTURE of student empowerment,
 Align systems to drive results in ACADEMICS.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Aligning Academics 2: Impact Journey training

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

2. PLCs focused on unpacking the standards, planning for instruction, and monitoring student data

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

3. Leadership Notebook implementation. Students will create their own goals for their learning, including lead measures, which they will monitor with accountability partners. Students will also track their own progress toward their goals.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

4. Coaching and support from our LIM coach

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

6. Teacher Leaders will serve as model classrooms and coach to support instruction.

Person Responsible Lauren Shoup (lauren.shoup@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning Gains for ESE students
Rationale: In 2018-19, Exceptional students scored 30% in ESSA data

Measurable Outcome: ESE student ESSA data will improve from 30% to 42% as shown by 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: We will monitor student progress on assessments through our electronic schoolwide database and administrative walkthroughs to view and support instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Leader in Me
4 Disciplines of Execution

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Involving students in the process of improvement increases the likelihood of buy-in and personal responsibility.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data conferences with individual students will identify a skill gap for each.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

2. Set a goal of reaching stretch goals, as measured by iReady

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

3. Identify lead measures for each student to incorporate addressing specific skill gap

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

4. Monitor implementation with an accountability partner.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

5. Monitor growth data through regular assessments

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@hcps.net)

6. Teach ESE students about the components of their IEPs and incorporate them as active participants in their IEP meetings.

Person Responsible Deborah Moltisanti (deborah.moltisanti@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.

The 2 highest ranked areas, based on 2019-20 data, were Physical Attack and Fighting, with 23 recorded incidents. For the 2021-22 school year, our school has implemented PBIS strategies into our school wide discipline plan. This works in concert with teaching students about leadership behaviors via Leader in Me. In addition, our Student Services department now has a fulltime psychologist on site to assist in restorative practices for students.

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.

Positive culture and environment will be addressed in two ways during 2021-22. First, we will continue to build student leadership skills via Leader in Me. We will expand student leadership roles in the classroom and school wide. This year, one of our goals is to create our Student Lighthouse Team. In addition, we are wrapping PBIS strategies into our Leader in Me focus to build consistent behavioral expectations at school with rewards and celebrations to accompany.

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

The teachers and staff on our Leadership and Culture Action Teams are responsible for setting goals and creating action steps for: Teaching Students to Lead, Creating a Leadership Environment, and Sharing Leadership.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------