**Hillsborough County Public Schools** 

# Mitchell 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

# **Mitchell Elementary School**

205 S BUNGALOW PARK AVE, Tampa, FL 33609

[ no web address on file ]

### **Demographics**

Principal: Renee Best Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2019

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	rmation*
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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### **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	19

# **Mitchell Elementary School**

205 S BUNGALOW PARK AVE, Tampa, FL 33609

[ no web address on file ]

#### **School Demographics**

School Type and Gi (per MSID		2020-21 Title I Schoo	l Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	School	No		22%
Primary Servio (per MSID I	• •	Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		36%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	Α	Α

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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 the desire, knowledge, and skills enabling students to reach their highest potential in the 21st century and beyond.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring lifelong learning and service for every student.

#### 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
Best, Renee	Principal	Instructional Leader Oversees PLC, Leadership teams, PSLT, analyzes data with teachers, monitor instruction through walkthroughs and feedback
Palmer, Alicia	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader Instructional Leader Helps facilitate PLC, Leadership teams, PSLT, analyzes data with teachers, monitor instruction through walkthroughs and feedback, ELL chair
Hall, Kellie	School Counselor	CST Chair, 504 chair, Provides SEL lessons to students, assists teachers in developing strategies and techniques to meet the needs of students, engages community members to help meet the needs of students, she provides support to families and provides one on one support to students.
Thaxton, Kathleen	SAC Member	SAC chair, creates open lines of communication through all stake holders and the school, facilitates meetings aimed at school improvement

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Saturday 8/10/2019, Renee Best

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

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

729

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

7

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

10

**Demographic Data** 

#### **Early Warning Systems**

#### 2021-22

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

Indicator					Grad	e Lev	el							Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	113	114	136	113	113	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	14	13	11	15	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
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														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total			
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2			
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/28/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	91	123	105	102	138	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	5	8	7	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	evel	l				Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAT
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

#### 2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Number of students enrolled	91	123	105	102	138	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	5	8	7	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

lodinato.	Grade Level										Total			
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				79%	52%	57%	76%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	55%	58%	68%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	50%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	54%	63%	80%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				78%	57%	62%	75%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	46%	51%	61%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				74%	50%	53%	75%	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	82%	52%	30%	58%	24%
Cohort Con	nparison					
04	2021					
	2019	75%	55%	20%	58%	17%
Cohort Con	nparison	-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	56%	20%
Cohort Con	nparison	-75%			•	

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	88%	54%	34%	62%	26%
Cohort Co	mparison					
04	2021					
	2019	77%	57%	20%	64%	13%
Cohort Co	mparison	-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	60%	22%
Cohort Co	mparison	-77%				

			SCIEN	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	72%	51%	21%	53%	19%
Cohort Con	nparison					

# Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I ready data

		Grade 1		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	72	92
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	20	50	79
	Students With Disabilities	50	57	57
	English Language Learners	29	57	71
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	55	77
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	14	29	42
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	29
	English Language Learners	0	29	71
		Grade 2		
	Number/% Proficiency	Grade 2 Fall	Winter	Spring
	Proficiency All Students		Winter 74	Spring 83
English Language Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall		
	Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities	Fall 48	74	83
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall 48 31	74 34	83 48
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency	Fall 48 31 23 0 Fall	74 34 31 25 Winter	83 48 54 75 Spring
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students	Fall 48 31 23	74 34 31 25	83 48 54 75
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall 48 31 23 0 Fall	74 34 31 25 Winter	83 48 54 75 Spring
Arts	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically	Fall 48 31 23 0 Fall 29	74 34 31 25 Winter 60	83 48 54 75 Spring 75

		Grade 3		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75	88	95
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	34	40	51
	Students With Disabilities	45	36	82
	English Language Learners	0	25	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	63	86
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	28	39	52
	Students With Disabilities	27	36	55
	English Language Learners	0	25	0
		Grade 4		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	Proficiency All Students		Winter 81	Spring 83
English Language Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall		
	Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities	Fall 66	81	83
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	<b>Fall</b> 66 27	81 39	83 53
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language	Fall 66 27 33	81 39 33	83 53 33
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students	Fall 66 27 33	81 39 33 25	83 53 33 38
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall 66 27 33 0 Fall	81 39 33 25 Winter	83 53 33 38 Spring
Arts	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically	Fall 66 27 33 0 Fall 57	81 39 33 25 Winter 71	83 53 33 38 Spring 91

		Grade 5		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	75	78
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	50	58	64
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	50
	English Language Learners	0	14	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61	69	82
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	58	61	67
	Students With Disabilities	63	50	60
	English Language Learners	0	21	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

# Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	57			52							
ELL	52	75		41	50		43				
ASN	91			73							
BLK	64			43							
HSP	75	83	73	71	61	45	60				
MUL	92			88							
WHT	87	79		89	74		82				
FRL	64	85	69	57	59	53	60				
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	53	39	41	47	54	53	20				
ELL	47	50	35	47	63	61					

		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	73			93							
BLK	50	46		67	69						
HSP	68	68	45	72	72	55	50				
MUL	81	45		85	82						
WHT	87	70	59	88	80	62	85				
FRL	52	51	39	58	65	56	44				
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	53	36	29	43	72	67	33				
ELL	41	64	62	37	64	62					
ASN	77			85							
BLK	40	64		55	64						
DLI		_									
HSP	58	55	54	62	69	56	52				
		55	54	62 71	69	56	52				
HSP	58	55 72	54 50		69 76	56 67	52 85				

### **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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	581
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

## **Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	82
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	54
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	
Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
	67 NO
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	_
Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	_
Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	_
Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students	NO
Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students	NO 90
Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO 90
Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	NO 90
Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students	NO 90
Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students  Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	90 NO
Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  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?	90 NO
Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  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?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	90 NO
Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  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?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%  White Students	90 NO N/A

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	65
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?

We need to focus on our percent of students making learning gains, especially with our bottom quartile. We also need to continue to focus on closing the achievement gap with our minority students.

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

The greatest concern is our percent of our bottom quartile students making learning gains

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

Our teachers will use checks for understanding and assessments as a way to target students that need acceleration in during small group instruction.

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

On our 2021 FSA the most improved area was in our bottom quartile learning gains in ELA.

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

Collaboration in planning and using data to target intentional small groups.

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

During PLC's teachers will plan for common assessments (checks for understanding) during students independent practice time. They will use the data collected to for intentional small groups. They will use the instructional guides to help which standards to target and when, in order to maximize the learning.

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 attend district monthly math PLCs.
- -A teacher from each grade level in intermediate will attend a training on how the planning support tools can support instruction as well as acceleration.
- -Continue to collaborate with our district math DRT to support the needs of our students.

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

-Continued systems of support such as our PSLT, weekly PLCs, data reviews

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### **Areas of Focus:**

#### **#1.** Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of

Focus Description

Description and Rationale:

Measurable

63% of our students, in the bottom quartile, made learning gains in ELA and 46% of our bottom quartile made learning gains in math. During PLC's teachers will plan for checks for understanding during students independent practice time. They will use the data collected to form intentional small groups aimed at accelerating students.

Our goal is to have 70% of our students in the bottom quartile make learning gains in both

**Outcome:** ELA and Math on the 2022 FSA.

**Monitoring:** We will monitor using Iready Diagnostic as well as monthly assessments.

Person responsible

**for** Renee Best (renee.best@hcps.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

**based** Acceleration vs Remediation

Strategy:

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Utilizing the model of acceleration vs remediation helps students to meet grade level expectations quicker by building on what they know vs on spending time closing gaps. By utilizing assessment during and at the end of each lesson teachers will be able to see what concept students need more instruction on during small group time. By analyzing data from theses assessment teachers can collaboratively plan small group lessons to provide students with high yield strategies to help them be successful on grade level work.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Aug 2021- Teachers engaged in district provided PD around acceleration

Person
Responsible
Renee Best (renee.best@hcps.net)

Sept-May- Teachers will collaboratively plan using data to drive their instruction.

Person
Responsible
Alicia Palmer (alicia.palmer@hcps.net)

Nov. 2021- Teachers engaged in PD on how to analyze math iready reports and diagnostics to meet the needs of students through acceleration.

Person
Responsible
Renee Best (renee.best@hcps.net)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Our school counselor will monitor our discipline data. We have a school wide behavior plan that supports positive behavior.

#### 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.

Communication continues to be a priority at Mitchell. Below are some of the ways we work at building positive relationships with our families and community.

- -Bobcat Blast (Weekly newletter)
- -Open house, conference night, parent workshops
- -Ell parent meetings
- -Teacher newsletters
- -Mitchell Foundation
- -Student Advisory Council
- -Twitter
- -PTA Facebook
- -Bobcat Buddies
- -CEO's in schools
- -Mystery Readers

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

We have many PTA and Foundation members. One of the things our PTA and Foundation does is recruit volunteers for numerous events we host. They also get sponsorships which support our students and schools. We have parents as part of our SAC committee that provide input when making decisions for our school.

# Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
		Total:	\$0.00