

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Hunter's Green 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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Hunter's Green Elementary School

9202 HIGHLAND OAK DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Libby

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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)	35%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Hunter's Green Elementary School

9202 HIGHLAND OAK DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[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	No	36%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

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

The educators, staff and volunteers of Hunter's Green Elementary School are committed to:

- * Providing students with the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to become productive contributors to society.
- * Actively involving the home, school, and community in providing resources to meet the needs of individual students in developing traits for self-fulfillment and participation in the school climate that will carry forth into an ever-changing global society.
- * Continually assessing and refining the educational processes to produce lifelong learners able to challenge the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hunter's Green Elementary School students will become productive contributors to society as lifelong learners and decision makers living in harmony with self and others.

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
Libby, Nicole	Principal	Mrs. Libby is responsible to oversee all of the student data and to help with the improvement.
Goldberg, Lourdes	Other	Mrs. Goldberg monitors our ELL students and then provides instruction based on their needs.
Harris, Chelsie	Attendance/ Social Work	Ms. Harris monitors attendance and then provides interventions to those students needing assistance.
Jefferson, Yaritza	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Jefferson works with our ESE students and teachers. She looks for areas of need and then helps provide support.
LeBlanc, Keli	School Counselor	Mrs. Leblanc works with our teachers and students with social emotional learning.
Provonscha-Bucher, Leslie	Psychologist	Mrs. Bucher helps identify students that need additional support and guides the teachers with RTI/MTSS.
SequeiraTorres, Diana	Instructional Media	Mrs. Sequeira Torres is an additional resource to help teachers and students with reading.
Matte, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Matte is our SAC chair.
Koehler, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Koehler supervises teachers to improve their teacher effectiveness.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Nicole Libby

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

740

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

4

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

9

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	109	114	126	108	111	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	6	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	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	1	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	1	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 8/30/2021

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	105	117	85	118	129	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	676
Attendance below 90 percent	9	9	5	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	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	2	0	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	105	117	85	118	129	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	676
Attendance below 90 percent	9	9	5	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	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	2	0	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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				72%	52%	57%	57%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	55%	58%	53%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	50%	53%	46%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				74%	54%	63%	56%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	57%	62%	47%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	46%	51%	25%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				65%	50%	53%	46%	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	74%	52%	22%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	88%	54%	34%	62%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	66%	57%	9%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	63%	51%	12%	53%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady was used to progress monitor students throughout the school year in reading and math. Students in grade 5 took a beginning of the year and mid-year science assessment provided by the district.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	66%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	56%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	22%	25%
	English Language Learners	10%	10%	50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	55%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	44%	49%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	22%	25%
	English Language Learners	10%	20%	50%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41%	63%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	29%	42%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	17%	71%
	English Language Learners	9%	25%	57%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24%	60%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	18%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	33%	29%
	English Language Learners	9%	31%	43%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66%	79%	86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	32%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	23%	56%
	English Language Learners	30%	30%	60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25%	56%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	18%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	9%	36%
	English Language Learners	0%	40%	70%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52%	57%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	30%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	23%
	English Language Learners	20%	25%	47%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43%	61%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	9%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	27%	34%
	English Language Learners	20%	38%	50%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	60%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	28%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	27%	35%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40%	58%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	11%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	18%	26%
	English Language Learners	25%	50%	75%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	65%	61%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	64%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	30%	36%	24%
	English Language Learners	0%	40%	33%

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	20	38	33	32	29	36	22				
ELL	64	80		76	50		60				
ASN	81	75		89	40		69				
BLK	58	54		46	46		54				
HSP	63	48	33	51	22		35				
MUL	65			78							
WHT	76	58		81	60		78				
FRL	58	49	44	52	40	38	57				
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	39	26	12	37	45	35	23				
ELL	64	58		60	61						
ASN	87	83		92	83						
BLK	63	59	40	66	49	33	54				
HSP	60	54	33	64	68	50	61				
MUL	79	63		79	63		100				
WHT	78	61	36	79	70	35	68				
FRL	60	52	36	59	55	27	58				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	39	25	18	21	6	17				
ELL	28	40	47	33	21	16					
ASN	56	67		56	58						
BLK	53	55	73	42	35	15	56				
HSP	48	44	40	50	38	25	21				
MUL	88	90		56	80						
WHT	67	53	29	72	60	21	59				
FRL	45	48	51	45	41	25	35				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
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	71
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	52
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	45
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	72
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	71
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	49
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?

The data component showing the lowest performance on FSA 2021 were the bottom quartile students making learning gains in both reading and math. Historically, students with disabilities have not significant gains in ELA and Math.

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

All scores increased on 2019 FSA.

Based on 2021 data, learning gains in both ELA and Math are areas for improvement. Learning gains were at 57% in ELA and 46% in Math for the 2021 year. Additionally, bottom-quartile gains in both ELA and Math are not showing the gains necessary to reach proficiency. ELA bottom-quartile gains was 38% and Math bottom-quartile gains was 43%.

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

Due to the pandemic, there is unfinished learning due to varying circumstances (mode of learning, students and/or staff quarantined throughout the year, social emotional impacts, accessibility to resources and/or tools).

Acceleration will be used within the classroom to help close the gaps and accelerate students to be on grade level. A specific focus on understanding, teaching and assessing grade level standards which will assist teachers in identifying areas to accel students.

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

HGE showed improvement in all areas in 2019.

According to 2021 data, our ELA bottom quartile went up 1% point, and our math bottom quartile went up 6% points.

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

The school had a very focused and purposeful action plan to meet the needs of all students. Teachers planned using the Florida Standards and based their lessons on them. For the 2019 school year, students in grades 3, 4, and 5 used I-Ready books to help master the standards in ELA, and then students in grades 3, 4, and 5 participated in the district's monthly math assessments. Teachers analyzed the data monthly and retaught specific standards as needed.

Daily small group instruction, data-driven PLCs, analysis of iReady data, Reflex, and collaboration with teachers and support staff.

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

Continue small group and differentiated instruction. Using the district guides to focus on areas where acceleration can take place. Continue data analysis with assessments/progress monitoring.

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.

Sharing information for current professional development being offered, data chats with admin, PD on aggressive monitoring and providing specific feedback to kids, and fishbowl opportunities.

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

Data chats with admin to focus on students, monthly ILT meetings, MTSS grade level meetings with student services

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing data, the ESSA Subgroup of Students with Disabilities show a low score of 31%, which shows that most of our ESE students are not making adequate gains in reading and math. Our students will receive various methods of rigorous, differentiated instruction including small group and individualized practice to meet the needs of every learner.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome is to increase achievement and learning gains as measured by state and district assessments as of May 2022.

Monitoring: Fidelity walk throughs with specific feedback. Review of progress monitoring data from iReady and/or common grade level assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nicole Libby (nicole.libby@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: To ensure the success of each student, all teachers are expected to identify students with disabilities, analyze purposeful, relevant information, and then select interventions and strategies based on individual student needs to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy is based on individual student needs in order to increase student achievement, primarily students with disabilities. The need for this strategy is based on our school data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data chats and updates conducted by Administration after each diagnostic, interim, form test, or district assessment.
2. Count sheets shared through Office 365 with each grade level, updated by leadership.
3. Students will receive small group/individual instruction daily that is based on their needs.
4. Guided reading will be purposeful and effective with explicit interventions and strategies based on professional development trainings.
5. All SWD will receive two guided reading groups daily.
6. School-wide RTI will be implemented by grade levels based on student needs and standards.

Person Responsible: Nicole Libby (nicole.libby@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

Our students will receive various methods of rigorous, differentiated instruction including small group and individualized practice, to meet the needs of every learner.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

The outcome is to increase achievement and learning gains as measured by state and district assessments as of May 2022.

Monitoring:

Fidelity walk throughs. Review of progress monitoring data. PLC agendas/notes.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Nicole Libby (nicole.libby@hcps.net)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Standards based instruction will be backwards planned to include specific learning targets and connected tasks that are aligned with the full rigor of the standards.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

This strategy is based on individual student needs in order to increase student achievement. By designing instruction with the end in mind, students and teachers both understand the desired goal. Steps and revisions can be made a long the way in order to meet the individual needs of each student to successfully reach the goal/learning target.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in collaborative planning with their teams in order to identify the learning targets of each standard and to understand their content complexity.
2. Teachers will collaborate to create common assessments aligned with the standards.
3. Grade levels will calibrate the quality work to ensure equity across the grade level.
4. Teachers will create learning objectives that include content, action, and evidence of learning, so that students are able to articulate their learning.

**Person
Responsible**

Nicole Libby (nicole.libby@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.

Hunter's Green Elementary ranked 416 out of 1395 elementary schools statewide. We have a great school climate and culture and safety is our number one priority. We use a Positive Behavior Support System for rewarding behavior schoolwide. In addition, our teachers use their own classroom behavior management systems.

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.

At Hunter's Green Elementary, we have high expectations for all students. Students come to Hunter's Green to learn in a safe and orderly environment. If a child does not know how to read, we teach. If a child does not know how to multiply, we teach. At Hunter's Green, we use that same philosophy when it comes to student behavior. Hunter's Green is a PBIS school that focuses on learning and implementing growth mindset strategies to all of our students. We will be using a school-wide behavior plan to ensure that all students are showing their panther pride daily. Research shows that children need to know what is expected of them and they need to be taught what that looks like. We will have school-wide behavior expectations posted throughout the school. Students earn Panther Bucks for following the expectations. Then they can use their cash to buy items from the Panther Mart, earn a VIP event, or participate in a school-wide behavior incentive.

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

Keli Leblanc and Lesli Bucher - PBIS Committee
Teams determined grade level systems to support students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00