

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Muller Elementary Magnet 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	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Muller Elementary Magnet School

13615 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33613

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melanie Bottini

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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: A (63%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (64%)
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

Muller Elementary Magnet School

13615 N 22ND ST, 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 KG-5	Yes	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

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

Muller Elementary Magnet School, staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Muller Elementary Magnet School will prepare students for life through the arts, science, and leadership.

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
Bottini, Melanie	Principal	1. Instructional Leadership 2. Safety and Security of all Stakeholders 3. Building Management 4. Culture Building
Pryor, Michelle	Assistant Principal	1. Instructional Leadership 2. Safety and Security of all Stakeholders 3. Building Management 4. Culture Building
Freiner, Kallie	Math Coach	1. Math Instruction 2. Math Planning with Teachers 3. Math Coaching Instruction 4. Math Data Analysis 5. Math Professional Development
Leach, Faye	Reading Coach	1. Reading Instruction 2. Reading Planning with Teachers 3. Reading Coaching Instruction 4. Reading Data Analysis 5. Reading Professional Development
Mansfield, Lyndee	School Counselor	SEL Support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Melanie Bottini

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.*

3

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

428

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

6

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

6

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	63	67	72	75	65	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	70	67	68	66	65	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	4	5	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	73	70	72	71	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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

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

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				64%	52%	57%	54%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	55%	58%	50%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	50%	53%	31%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	54%	63%	57%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				74%	57%	62%	60%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	46%	51%	37%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				61%	50%	53%	70%	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	68%	52%	16%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

2020-2021

Grades 3, 4, and 5 = Baseline and Mid Year Assessments

Grades K, 1, and 2 = I-Ready

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	39	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	51	75
	Students With Disabilities	38	50	75
	English Language Learners	18	47	76
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	5	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	44	72
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	63
	English Language Learners	18	35	65

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	47	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	46	73
	Students With Disabilities	9	36	36
	English Language Learners	8	23	69
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38	67	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	35	54
	Students With Disabilities	9	9	36
	English Language Learners	0	23	38

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	42	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	55	61
	Students With Disabilities	25	19	31
	English Language Learners	10	10	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	58	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	28	54
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	31
	English Language Learners	0	0	40

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	43	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	38	32
	Students With Disabilities	5	20	20
	English Language Learners	12	12	12
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	21	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	26	42
	Students With Disabilities	5	15	25
	English Language Learners	0	6	29

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		26	49	20
	Economically Disadvantaged		19	34	46
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	21
	English Language Learners		0	0	20
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		3	37	21
	Economically Disadvantaged		25	34	52
	Students With Disabilities		7	7	27
	English Language Learners		0	0	40
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		55	73	45
	Economically Disadvantaged		51	45	
	Students With Disabilities		55	45	
	English Language Learners		51	36	
		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	11	31		28	38		8				
ELL	28			50							
BLK	45	46	30	48	54		43				
HSP	39	43		51	70		35				
MUL				70							
WHT	60			60							
FRL	38	47	31	48	62	43	42				
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	47	55		42	68	55					
ELL	35	52	58	55	73	54	47				
BLK	67	59	69	51	68	53	40				

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
HSP	53	61	62	63	73	57	67				
WHT	80	80		72	87						
FRL	59	63	65	57	71	57	57				
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	24	48	33	28	52	42	27				
ELL	21	40		31	44						
BLK	52	40	21	48	47	28	70				
HSP	49	56	40	57	64		63				
WHT	67	53		75	87						
FRL	52	48	27	54	56	31	70				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	70
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	60
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	46
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?

A trend that emerged across grade levels is a decrease in proficiency for Reading, Math, and Science (for 5th grade) and a decrease in learning gains in Reading and Math.

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

Based on 2020 state scores: In 2019 Difference

Reading Proficiency is 43% 64 -21

Math Proficiency is 52% 61 -9

Science Proficiency is 45% 61 -16

Reading Gains are 44% 63 -19

Math Learning Gains are 60% 74 -14

Reading BQ Gains 64

Math BQ Gains 55

317/500 points 442 -79

49%=C 63.1=A

Reading Proficiency shows the greatest need for improvement, followed by Reading Gains, and Science Proficiency.

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

Based on 2020 state assessments:

Students need to make substantial progress in order to be proficient in ELA. Science Proficiency closely correlates to reading deficits and Science proficiency also needs to significantly increase.

Action Plans include: Schoolwide weekly tracking of iReady Reading (and Math) proficiency. Monthly monitoring of Science proficiency with an increased emphasis on the Scientific Process.

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

Based on 2020 state assessments:

Math Proficiency showed a drop but, was the least difference in 2020. In 2019, Math Learning gains showed the greatest increase.

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

A new Math Coach who provided support in teaching Math, working with small groups, and planning for Math instruction contributed to this growth (or minimal drop in 2020).

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

Teachers intervening at just the right time.
Using grade level lessons and beyond with scaffolding support.
Connecting unfinished learning into the context of new 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.

Continuous classroom walkthroughs using the Instructional Priorities Look Fors Checklists will steer PD.

PD will include: How to Accelerate Learning, Using rubrics and check stations, Four Principles of Excellent Teaching, Keys to Small Group Instruction.

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

The Leadership Team will monitor weekly progress in Reading and Math and the Reading Resource Teacher, Math Resource Teacher, and Science Lead Teacher will continue to support instructional planning and PLC's each week.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

The need to accelerate learning is a critical need based on a significant drop in Reading, Math, and Science when comparing 2021 FSA Data with 2019 FSA Data.

The data shows a significant drop in Reading proficiency since 2019 (-21), a drop in Math proficiency since 2019 (-9), and a significant drop in Science since 2019 (-16).

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our Instructional Priorities are: Student achievement will increase through acceleration by intervening at just the right time, using grade level lessons and beyond with scaffolding support, and connecting unfinished learning into the context of new learning.

In order to ensure that this is taking place weekly walkthroughs will be conducted by the Principal and Assistant Principal.

Specific Walkthrough Look Fors Include: What the TEACHER should be doing, what STUDENTS should be doing, how the ENVIRONMENT supports the learning, and what RESOURCES are being used.

Measurable Outcome:

With a significant drop in Reading proficiency since 2019 (-21), we will increase by 19 points by December 2021.

With a drop in Math proficiency since 2019 (-9), we will increase by 9 points by December 2021.

With a significant drop in Science 2019 (-16), we will increase by 9 points by December 2021.

Our 2021-2022 Instructional Priorities Walkthrough "Look-Fors" Checklist and the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction will be used to give actionable walkthrough feedback to each instructional staff member at least every two weeks in addition to the district required scheduled formal and unscheduled informal EET Observations.

Monitoring:

In addition to the Formal and Informal Evaluation Feedback, the Principal and Assistant Principal will conduct walkthroughs each week using Muller's Instructional Priorities Acceleration Look For Checklist. Immediately following a walkthrough, written feedback is given directly to the teacher in the class by the Principal or sent electronically by the Assistant Principal.

The Leadership Team will analyze the observation trends and determine next steps. The Leadership Team which includes both the school Reading Resource and Math Resource teacher will coach and support planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Evidence of increased teacher effectiveness through improved targeted weekly feedback (.75 is feedback effect size) to teachers from walkthroughs using the Instructional Priorities Acceleration Look-For Checklist.(.68 is acceleration effect size).

Increase in student iReady scores and usage in both Reading and Math.

Increase in students scores in (monthly) Reading and Math.

Rationale

for In 2021, the FSA ELA data showed a decrease of 21 percentage points. The improvement strategy of feedback to teachers (with an effectiveness size for feedback at .75) will result in improved teaching and student academic performance.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

2021 FSA Data is analyzed and reviewed.
Principal writes 3 Instructional Priorities and the Walkthrough Look-Fors Checklist.
The Instructional Prorities and Look-Fors is edited and approved by the Leadership Team.
Assistant Principal shares data with staff.
Principal shares Instructional Priorities, and Look Fors checklist with instructional staff.
Walkthroughs with immediate feedback to teachers take place each week.

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

Trends from the walkthroughs are discussed and analyzed by the Leadership team. Based on the results, teachers receive support, coaching, and lesson planning with the Reading and Math Resource Teachers.

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 2021 ELA FSA scores only 47% in 3rd grade, 38% in 4th grade, and 44% in 5th grade scored at a level 3 proficiency or higher. This score was due to inconsistent ELA instruction in person and virtually in 2020-2021. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include consistent instructional coaching for teachers that will result in an improvement in student proficiency on the 2022 ELA FSA Score.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2021 FSA was 43%. The 2022 FSA ELA Assessment will increase by at least 7%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be closely monitored through our current administrative Walkthroughs and the Formal Observation process as well as monitoring student ELA test data for growth. In addition, a representative from the Leadership Team will be present during each grade level planning session, grade level PLCs, meetings with district resource coaches, and learning walks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategies for improving ELA instruction will include instructional coaching and modeling for: planning, data analysis, accelerated instruction, small group instruction, questioning, assessment and rubrics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In 2021, the FSA ELA data showed a decrease of 21 percentage points. The improvement strategy of ELA coaching (with an effectiveness size for feedback at .75) will result in improved teaching and student academic performance in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

Hire a Reading Resource Teacher. The Reading Resource Teacher will focus on coaching, modeling, and standards based lesson planning Reading/ELA/Writing weekly in grades K-5 under the supervision of the principal. The Reading Resource Teacher will teach small reading groups of students in the lower quartile and students who are close to making learning gains. The reading coach will attend PLC's and Planning with each grade level in order to plan for instruction and analyze assessment data and needs.

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

Professional Development will be planned and presented by the Reading Resource Teachers and side by side coaching will be given to teachers based on the instructional needs from the EET and Walkthrough data.

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

Weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) for each grade level to analyze class a test data, determine root causes/needs, and create next steps for student instruction will be lead by the Reading Resource Teacher and Administration.

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@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 2019 shows a high concern with 11 incidents involving physical aggression/bullying/or fighting. The students received additional services, special support, and if qualified, served in special programs. Muller Elementary Magnet School fosters a supportive and positive environment in which relationships between one another thrive with respect, high expectations, staff and student leadership, positivity, and trust.

In addition to the behavioral goals established from the annual incident report, which shows that the incidents occur on the 2 hour bus ride to and from our magnet school, special leadership roles are given to students and consistent monitoring occurs each day as adults greet and send off our buses.

Each week the student services team along with at least one administrator reviews behavior data in our weekly Student Services Meeting in order to monitor improvement and consult and plan next steps.

Muller Elementary Magnet School is a Leader In Me School which focuses on Covey's 7 Habits of Highly Effective People (and Kids). Key concepts of Leadership, Academics, and Culture are learned and practiced by staff and students every day!

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.

Muller Elementary Magnet School fosters a supportive and positive environment in which relationships between one another thrive with respect, high expectations, staff and student leadership, positivity, and trust.

Muller Elementary Magnet School is a Leader In Me School which focuses on Covey's 7 Habits of Highly Effective People (and Kids). Key concepts of Leadership, Academics, and Culture are learned and practiced by staff and students. On the last day of school in the unique year of 2020, Muller Elementary Magnet School was awarded the prestigious Leader in Me Lighthouse School Award!

This award was based on Student Leadership, School Culture, Environment for Learning, and Academics. Staff professional development upon being hired starts with teachers learning and living the 7 Habits in

order to strengthen the professional culture. Students are taught and practice the 7 Habits which incorporates a positive school culture by goal setting, problem solving, knowing oneself, and positive peer interactions.

Each year, all stakeholders participate in a yearly Leader in Me Survey to progress monitor the key components of Leader In Me. The data from this survey and from the new 2020 Insight Survey help us build a better culture each year.

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

Principal-reviews survey results with staff, celebrates top areas and creates an action plan collaboratively with the staff for areas of concern. Communicates the plan and models positivity and a growth mindset.

Assistant Principal- Assists with data analysis, survey distribution, planning, and Power Point presentations to communicate plans for a positive and informative learning environment. Communicates the plan and models a growth mindset.

Guidance Counselor-Guidance lessons for student support a positive culture and Habit Heroes celebrations

Staff- Collaborates after analyzing school culture data to contribute ideas for a plan based on survey results.

Parents-participates in surveys, gives feedback, helps analyze data through PTA and the School Advisory Council.

Students-Learns the 7 Habits, practices the 7 Habits, holds leadership roles, plans schoolwide events, leads schoolwide events as emcees, directors, tour guides, etc. gives feedback, and celebrates habit success through our Habits Heroes Celebrations

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2110	100-Salaries	3181 - Muller Elementary Magnet School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach's Salary- Reading Resource Teacher</i>			
	2110	100-Salaries	3181 - Muller Elementary Magnet School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach's Salary- Math Coach</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3181 - Muller Elementary Magnet School			\$0.00
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3181 - Muller Elementary Magnet School			\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00

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