

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Mort Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>

# Mort Elementary School

1806 E BEARSS AVE, Tampa, FL 33613

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Kelly Snellgrove

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: D (38%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: D (39%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>

## Mort Elementary School

1806 E BEARSS AVE, Tampa, FL 33613

[ 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	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Mort Elementary engages families and partners to provide services that inspire the community to ensure students excel as successful and responsible citizens.

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

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Mort Elementary will create an innovative environment which empowers students, encourages parents, enriches families, and elevates the community.

Tagline: "Uniting the community today to nurture the leaders of tomorrow."

### 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
Hailey-Brown, Latiecea	Principal	Leading teachers and staff, set goals and ensure students meet their learning objectives. Overseeing the school's day-to-day operations means handling disciplinary matters, managing a budget and hiring teachers and other personnel.
Snellgrove, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Supporting the principal with leading teachers and staff, set goals and ensure students meet their learning objectives. Overseeing the school's day-to-day operations means handling disciplinary matters, managing a budget and hiring teachers and other personnel.
Bhagwandeem-Girwarnath, Sangeeta	SAC Member	Helping to develop the School Improvement Plan. Adopting and disseminating an annual school report. Approving the school budget as presented by the principal. Soliciting input and hearing concerns of constituents about school programs and student life.
Hernandez, Sara	Teacher, K-12	Helping to develop the School Improvement Plan. Adopting and disseminating an annual school report. Approving the school budget as presented by the principal. Soliciting input and hearing concerns of constituents about school programs and student life.
Dyer, Jamie	Reading Coach	To support literacy best practices via coaching, mentoring, modeling and teaching.
Kontra, Kristen	Math Coach	To support math best practices via coaching, mentoring, teaching , and professional development as well as teaching.
Richards, Stacy	Other	To support students and teachers in understand writing best practices.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kelly Snellgrove

**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.*

2

**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.*

12

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

46



**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

850

**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.**

8

**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	100	128	133	163	121	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	785
Attendance below 90 percent	36	69	52	71	44	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
One or more suspensions	6	1	4	0	2	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	29	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
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	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	5	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

**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	

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

Monday 6/14/2021

**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	128	139	156	142	151	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	837
Attendance below 90 percent	39	50	67	43	42	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	284
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	29	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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

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

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

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

**2020-21 - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	128	139	156	142	151	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	837
Attendance below 90 percent	39	50	67	43	42	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	284
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	29	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

**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				31%	52%	57%	36%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	55%	58%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	50%	53%	60%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				35%	54%	63%	46%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				38%	57%	62%	61%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	46%	51%	52%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				29%	50%	53%	45%	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	21%	52%	-31%	58%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2021					
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	62%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	30%	57%	-27%	64%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	60%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	25%	51%	-26%	53%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-5 used I-READY as a monitoring tool.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	29	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	29	39
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	50
	English Language Learners	17	29	38
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	24	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	17	50
	Students With Disabilities	8	17	50
	English Language Learners	13	24	43

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	27	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	27	40
	Students With Disabilities	31	40	56
	English Language Learners	0	0	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	17	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	17	33
	Students With Disabilities	24	33	54
	English Language Learners	7	33	47
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	44	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	44	29
	Students With Disabilities	38	63	46
	English Language Learners	0	11	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	38	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	47	45
	Students With Disabilities	19	46	45
	English Language Learners	0	22	49

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	29	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	29	28
	Students With Disabilities	6	19	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	22	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	22	48
	Students With Disabilities	16	25	29
	English Language Learners	0	20	47
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	35	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	35	49
	Students With Disabilities	30	23	34
	English Language Learners	3	4	4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	34	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	34	50
	Students With Disabilities	16	21	25
	English Language Learners	8	9	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

**Subgroup Data Review**

<b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b>
SWD	11	30		18	43	47	16				
ELL	30	53	74	32	50	58	26				
BLK	24	38		14	24	27	5				
HSP	33	49	71	35	48	58	33				
WHT	32			21							
FRL	31	46	70	30	42	42	29				
<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
SWD	5	42	56	14	32	42	8				
ELL	24	51	53	37	41	41	19				
BLK	22	37	47	26	27	30	19				
HSP	33	53	53	39	42	43	31				
MUL	55			36							
WHT	33	40		26	40						
FRL	31	49	52	36	39	38	28				
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	14	48	55	25	63	52	35				
ELL	31	53	56	42	63	52	37				
BLK	29	48	62	35	50	50	41				
HSP	40	50	57	50	65	53	43				
WHT	31	47		54	50						
FRL	36	49	61	46	61	53	45				

**ESSA Data Review**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	22
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	46
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	



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	27
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
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?

Based on this years walk through data we noticed 80 percent of our students responded well to small group instruction. Our ESSA subgroup students BLK, WHITE, and ESE all were supported with a direct academic plan.

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

Based on the 2019 data our math and science content were our lowest areas.

#### 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 math instructional understanding from the staff, lack of science support during planning. Math coach to support the instructional focus, Science support during planning.

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

Our third grade data increased by 11%, our Iready math data increased, and our science Mid Year exam showed and increase.

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

Small group instruction with a focus on the students clear academic path.

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

Continue small group instruction with a focus on each individual students needs. Common planning with coaches to make sure the standards and task are aligned. Meaning full support that's data driven.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional development will developed based on the walk through data and the academic data. Mondays and Tuesdays teachers will attend professional development such as Data Driven instruction, Kagan, Aggressive monitoring, ALL things PLC to support school wide and or individual needs.

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

Due to the recent pandemic were adding layers of grade level support to help during the day with students. We will also have after school and Saturday school and tutoring to support gaps, and or enrichment.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Description: Small group instruction to support the learning process for all students.
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	Rationale: Based on the 2021 math FSA scores, 29% scored proficiency for grades three through five. These scores were due to focusing on small group instruction. By focusing on math proficiency, the instructional improvements will include clear steps to focus on the individual student learning paths, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	10 percent of our SWD, white and black students in grades 3-5 will increase in the Math content area.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Our SWD, Black and White subgroups will be monitored via common planning, walkthroughs, weekly DATA chats (PLCs), Common assessments, daily exit ticket, and ILT.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kristen Kontra (kristen.kontra@hcps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Gradual Release of Responsibility Instructional Framework Nancy Frey and Douglas Fisher It provides the opportunity for all students to learn content at a pace and level they understand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jean Piaget's work on cognitive structures and schema (1952).</li> <li>- Lev Vygotsky's work on zones of proximal development (1962, 1978).</li> <li>- Albert Bandura's work on attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation (1965).</li> <li>- David Wood, Jerome Bruner, and Gail Ross's work on scaffolded instruction (1976)</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>The rationale to close the achievement gap while allow students to engage in learning that supports their direct need for growth. The teacher needs additional training on releasing responsibility to students while providing instructional scaffolds to ensure that students are successful. The gradual release of responsibility model of instruction suggests that cognitive work should shift slowly and intentionally from teacher modeling, to joint responsibility between teachers and students, to independent practice and application by the learner (Pearson &amp; Gallagher, 1983). This model provides a structure for teachers to move from assuming "all the responsibility for performing a task to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility" (Duke &amp; Pearson, 2004, p. 211). Small group instruction allows teachers to ensure students have an equitable learning experience and can be just as successful as their peers in the educational setting.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

Arrange for common planning times for grade level and content area teachers everyday.

**Person Responsible** Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

Create and implement planning template that incorporates small group instruction expectations. Using a standard planning proforma will ensure key small group instruction expectations are being planned for.

- Learning Targets
- Learning Strategies
- Essential Question
- Interactive notebooks
- Collaborative peer conversation (Accountable Talk)
- Preteach-Reteach
- Aggressive Monitoring
- Exit Tickets
- Evidence of Data Driven Instruction

**Person Responsible** Kristen Kontra (kristen.kontra@hcps.net)

Coaches and planning facilitator will use the template to support planning. During planning specific student needs should be identified to provide direct support.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Kontra (kristen.kontra@hcps.net)

Coaches and Leadership will facilitate walk-throughs to check the implementation of the planning.

Create Look- Fors using the small group expectations-

- Learning Targets (Teacher)
- Modeling (Teacher)
- Learning Strategies (Teacher and Students are using a strategies)
- Essential Question (Teacher explains the EQ Students Understand the EQ)
- Interactive notebooks (Students)
- Collaborative peer conversation as needed (Teachers models Accountable Talk) (Students are using accountable talk strategies)
- Preteach-Reteach (Teacher has evidence of Pre/Re Teaching ie Poster, Notes on Board ETC)
- Aggressive Monitoring (Teacher has tracker to show they are monitoring students learning)
- Exit Tickets (Teacher explains exit ticket/ Students use Exit tickets to track learning)
- Evidence of Data Driven Instruction (Teachers plan with team and coaches/ Plans should be adjusted for each group)

Coaches and Leadership will facilitate walk-throughs to check the implementation of the focus and look fors. Walk throughs occur Monday -Thursday.

**Person Responsible** Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

Leadership and coaches will analyze the data to create professional development based on the data. Data is analyzed daily all trends are reviewed Thursday afternoons.

Create a specific PD based on the current need. PD will occur during Mini Mondays after school or Tuesdays during staff meetings. Training will be provided where identified areas need support. (Teacher coaching, Grade level PD, Whole School PD)

**Person Responsible** Kristen Kontra (kristen.kontra@hcps.net)

Coaches and Leadership will continue to conduct walk throughs to support core instruction and small group learning using the gradual release of responsibility instructional framework as a guide to next steps.

**Person Responsible** Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

Coaches and Leadership will facilitate walk-throughs to check the implementation of the planning. Core instructional will be monitoring using the 4 Principals of Excellent instruction to determine effectiveness and inform the support needed for teachers and students. The sections focused on Rigorous content and Academic ownership will be utilized.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Description: Small group instruction to support the learning process for all students. Rationale: Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 32% in grade 3, 26% in grade 4, and 29% in grade 5 scored at proficiency. By focusing on ELA proficiency, the instructional improvements will include clear steps to focus on the individual student learning paths, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	SWD, white and black students in grades 3-5 will increase by at least 10% in the ELA content area.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Our SWD, Black and White subgroups will be monitored via common planning, walkthroughs, weekly DATA chats (PLCs), Common assessments, daily exit ticket, and ILT.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jamie Dyer (jamie.dyer@hcps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Gradual Release of Responsibility Instructional Framework Nancy Frey and Douglas Fisher It provides the opportunity for all students to learn content at a pace and level they understand. - Jean Piaget's work on cognitive structures and schema (1952). - Lev Vygotsky's work on zones of proximal development (1962, 1978). - Albert Bandura's work on attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation (1965). - David Wood, Jerome Bruner, and Gail Ross's work on scaffolded instruction (1976)
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The rationale to close the achievement gap while allow students to engage in learning that supports their direct need for growth. The teacher needs additional training on releasing responsibility to students while providing instructional scaffolds to ensure that students are successful. The gradual release of responsibility model of instruction suggests that cognitive work should shift slowly and intentionally from teacher modeling, to joint responsibility between teachers and students, to independent practice and application by the learner (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). This model provides a structure for teachers to move from assuming "all the responsibility for performing a task . . . to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility" (Duke & Pearson, 2004, p. 211). Small group instruction allows teachers to ensure students have an equitable learning experience and can be just as successful as their peers in the educational setting.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Arrange for common daytime planning times for grade level and content area teachers every day.

**Person Responsible** Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

2. Create and implement that planning template that incorporates small group instruction expectations. Creating and using a standard planning proforma will ensure key small group instruction expectations are being planned for.
- Learning Targets
  - Learning Strategies
  - Essential Question
  - Interactive notebooks
  - Collaborative peer conversation (Accountable Talk)
  - Preteach-Reteach
  - Aggressive Monitoring

- Exit Tickets
- Evidence of Data Driven Instruction

**Person Responsible** Jamie Dyer (jamie.dyer@hcps.net)

Coaches and planning facilitator will use the template to support planning. During planning specific student needs should be identified to provide direct support.

**Person Responsible** Jamie Dyer (jamie.dyer@hcps.net)

4. Coaches and Leadership will facilitate walk-throughs to check the implementation of the planning. Create Look- Fors using the small group expectations-

- Learning Targets (Teacher)
- Learning Strategies (Teacher and Students are using a strategies)
- Essential Question (Teacher explains the EQ Students Understand the EQ)
- Interactive notebooks (Students)
- Collaborative peer conversation (Teachers models Accountable Talk) (Students are using accountable talk strategies)
- Preteach-Reteach (Teacher has evidence of Pre/Re Teaching ie Poster, Notes on Board ETC)
- Aggressive Monitoring (Teacher has tracker to show they are monitoring students learning)
- Exit Tickets (Teacher explains exit ticket/ Students use Exit tickets to track learning)
- Evidence of Data Driven Instruction (Teachers plan with team and coaches/ Plans should be adjusted for each group)

Coaches and Leadership will facilitate walk-throughs to check the implementation of the focus and look fors. Walk throughs occur Monday -Thursday.

**Person Responsible** Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

5. Leadership and coaches will analyze the data to create professional development based on the data. Data is analyzed daily all trends are reviewed Thursday afternoons.

Create a specific PD based on the current need. PD will occur during Mini Mondays after school or Tuesdays during staff meetings. Training will be provided where identified areas need support. (Teacher coaching, Grade level PD, Whole School PD)

**Person Responsible** Jamie Dyer (jamie.dyer@hcps.net)

Coaches and Leadership will continue to conduct walk throughs to support small group learning using the gradual release of responsibility instructional framework as a guide to next steps.

**Person Responsible** Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Description: Small group instruction to support the learning process for all students.</p> <p>Rationale: Based on the 2021 State science scores, 28% scored proficiency for grade five. These scores were due to focusing on small group instruction. By focusing on science proficiency, the instructional improvements will include clear steps to focus on the individual student learning paths, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	10 percent of our SWD, white and black students in grades 3-5 will increase in the science content area.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Our SWD, Black and White subgroups will be monitored via common planning, walkthroughs, weekly DATA chats (PLCs), Common assessments, daily exit ticket, and ILT.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kelly Snellgrove (kelly.snellgrove@hcps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Gradual Release of Responsibility Instructional Framework Nancy Frey and Douglas Fisher It provides the opportunity for all students to learn content at a pace and level they understand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jean Piaget's work on cognitive structures and schema (1952).</li> <li>- Lev Vygotsky's work on zones of proximal development (1962, 1978).</li> <li>- Albert Bandura's work on attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation (1965).</li> <li>- David Wood, Jerome Bruner, and Gail Ross's work on scaffolded instruction (1976)</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>The rationale to close the achievement gap while allow students to engage in learning that supports their direct need for growth. The teacher needs additional training on releasing responsibility to students while providing instructional scaffolds to ensure that students are successful. The gradual release of responsibility model of instruction suggests that cognitive work should shift slowly and intentionally from teacher modeling, to joint responsibility between teachers and students, to independent practice and application by the learner (Pearson &amp; Gallagher, 1983). This model provides a structure for teachers to move from assuming "all the responsibility for performing a task . . . to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility" (Duke &amp; Pearson, 2004, p. 211). Small group instruction allows teachers to ensure students have an equitable learning experience and can be just as successful as their peers in the educational setting.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

Arrange a for common day time planning times for grade level and content area teachers everyday.

**Person Responsible** Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

Create and implement the planning template that incorporates small group instruction expectations. Creating and using a standard planning proforma will ensure key small group instruction expectations are being planned for.

- Learning Targets
- Learning Strategies
- Essential Question
- Interactive notebooks
- Collaborative peer conversation (Accountable Talk)
- Preteach-Reteach
- Aggressive Monitoring



- Exit Tickets
- Evidence of Data Driven Instruction

**Person Responsible** Kelly Snellgrove (kelly.snellgrove@hcps.net)

Coaches and planning facilitator will use the template to support planning. During planning specific student needs should be identified to provide direct support.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Snellgrove (kelly.snellgrove@hcps.net)

4. Coaches and Leadership will facilitate walk-throughs to check the implementation of the planning. Create Look- Fors using the small group expectations-

- Learning Targets (Teacher)
- Learning Strategies (Teacher and Students are using a strategies)
- Essential Question (Teacher explains the EQ Students Understand the EQ)
- Interactive notebooks (Students)
- Collaborative peer conversation (Teachers models Accountable Talk) (Students are using accountable talk strategies)
- Preteach-Reteach (Teacher has evidence of Pre/Re Teaching ie Poster, Notes on Board ETC)
- Aggressive Monitoring (Teacher has tracker to show they are monitoring students learning)
- Exit Tickets (Teacher explains exit ticket/ Students use Exit tickets to track learning)
- Evidence of Data Driven Instruction (Teachers plan with team and coaches/ Plans should be adjusted for each group)

Coaches and Leadership will facilitate walk-throughs to check the implementation of the focus and look fors. Walk throughs occur Monday -Thursday.

**Person Responsible** Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

5. Leadership and coaches will analyze the data to create professional development based on the data. Data is analyzed daily all trends are reviewed Thursday afternoons.

Create a specific PD based on the current need. PD will occur during Mini Mondays after school or Tuesdays during staff meetings. Training will be provided where identified areas need support. (Teacher coaching, Grade level PD, Whole School PD)

**Person Responsible** Kelly Snellgrove (kelly.snellgrove@hcps.net)

Coaches and Leadership will continue to conduct walk throughs to support small group learning using the gradual release of responsibility instructional framework as a guide to next steps.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Snellgrove (kelly.snellgrove@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.

**Mort social service team along with CHS our community partner will monitor the students behavior. This will help determine how to better service the students and support there social emotional barriers that sometimes causes them to react in away that creates discipline concerns.**



## 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 have also built a strong student leadership program that we refer to as C.A.S.A. A program that was developed to support students character , Academics, Service and Attendance. The program support all students

and staff with in the building. Creating a culture of togetherness and strength lead by students.

The community partnership schools objective is to meet the social, emotional, mental, physical, nutritional and sometimes financial needs of students so they are ready and able to fully engage in the rigorous academic opportunities offered by their school.

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

Mort Elementary became a Community Partnership School during the 2015-2016 school year. The Community Partnership Schools™ model involves the forming of a long-term partnership among at least four core partners — a school district, a university or college, a community based nonprofit, and a healthcare provider, as well as others. This comprehensive model of a community school leverages the social and institutional capital of the partners, making it possible for the school to offer resources and services that address the needs identified by the community. We have six core partners who have signed a long-term Memorandum of Agreement, making the commitment to work collaboratively to improve the Mort community as well as the lives of our students, staff and families. Our core partners are Hillsborough County Public Schools, Children's Home Society, Tampa Family Health Centers, University of South Florida, Tampa Innovation Place, and University Area CDC. Along with our core MOA partners, we have a number of community business partners who support our efforts, including Publix, Bay Hope Church, Diamond View Studios, Bible-Based Church, Vistra Communications, DTCC, Straz Center for the Performing Arts, and Caspers.

Through these partnerships, supports are provided on the campus to help bridge the gaps and wrap our families in needed services, including a base of volunteers who assist with students, staff and parents. Additional supports include clothing, meals, health and wellness services, increased parental involvement, and academic enrichment and tutoring, all of which release teachers and administrators to focus on academics.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$115,255.81
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$54,600.04
			Notes: *This is a math resource position that will support the instructional needs. The Resource Teacher support administration with walkthroughs to check implementation of the planning. They will create look-fors using the small group expectations. They will model for teachers around learning strategies, essential question, and interactive notebooks.			
	5100	210-Retirement	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,907.72
			Notes: *Math Resource Retirement (10.82%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,385.20
			Notes: *Math Resource FICA (6.2%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$791.70
			Notes: *Math Resource Medicare (1.45%)			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$10,374.01
			Notes: *Math Resource Health and Life Insurance (19%)			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$278.46
			Notes: *Math Resource Workers Comp (.51%)			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG	0.5	\$29,275.03
			Notes: *This is a teacher leadership position that supports the needs of all the students and staff in Math. The position will support classroom teachers through planning and modeling. They will support with collaborative peer conversation as needed.			
	5100	210-Retirement	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,167.56
			Notes: *Teacher Leader 2 Retirement (10.82%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,815.05
			Notes: *Teacher Leader 2 FICA (6.2%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$424.49
			Notes: *Teacher Leader 2 Medicare (1.45%)			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,087.25
			Notes: *Teacher Leader 2 Health and Life Insurance (19%)			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$149.30

			Notes: *Teacher Leader 2 Workers Comp (.51%)			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$173,403.03</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$69,510.13
			Notes: *Writing Resource Teacher will provide writing support for K-5 teachers and students. The resource teacher will coach, model, and provide professional development for teachers. The resource teacher will also provide small group instruction to target specific students in 3rd-5th with needs in writing.			
	5100	210-Retirement	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$7,520.99
			Notes: *Writing Resource Retirement (10.82%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$4,309.63
			Notes: *Writing Resource FICA (6.2%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,007.90
			Notes: *Writing Resource Medicare (1.45%)			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$13,206.92
			Notes: *Writing Resource Health and Life Insurance (19%)			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$354.50
			Notes: *Writing Resource Workers Comp (.51%)			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$33,406.81
			Notes: Tutoring- After school tutorial will take place with 15 teachers for 4 hours per week for 20 weeks at \$27 per hour. The teachers will tutor 200 students in 3rd-5th grades with a focus on Tier 2 students and students who scored a level 2 or 3 on FSA ELA and Math.			
	5100	210-Retirement	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,614.62
			Notes: Tutoring Retirement (10.82%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,071.22
			Notes: Tutoring FICA (6.2%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$484.40
			Notes: Tutoring Medicare (1.45%)			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$170.37
			Notes: Tutoring Workers Comp (.51%)			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG	0.5	\$27,700.06

			Notes: *This is a teacher leadership position that supports the needs of all the students and staff in ELA. The position will support classroom teachers through planning and modeling. They will support with collaborative peer conversation as needed.			
	5100	210-Retirement	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,997.15
			Notes: *Teacher Leader Retirement 10.82%.			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,717.40
			Notes: *Teacher Leader FICA 6.2%			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$401.65
			Notes: *Teacher Leader Medicare 1.45%			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$4,788.01
			Notes: *Teacher Leader Health and Life Insurance 19%			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$141.27
			Notes: *Teacher Leader Workers Comp .51%			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>				<b>\$80,873.45</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$58,750.14
			Notes: *RTI Teacher will train faculty on the MTSS/RtI process. The teacher will conduct monthly grade level RtI meetings to identify students who are in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. The teacher will crease a system for teacher to refer students who are having academic behavior or social concerns.			
	5100	210-Retirement	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$6,356.76
			Notes: *RTI Retirement (10.82%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,642.51
			Notes: *RTI FICA (6.2%)			
	5100	220-Social Security	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$851.88
			Notes: *RTI Medicare (1.45%)			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$10,972.53
			Notes: *RTI Health and Life Insurance (19%)			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	3121 - Mort Elementary School	UniSIG		\$299.63
			Notes: *RTI Workers Comp (.51%)			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$388,526.25</b>