

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Chiles Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Chiles Elementary School

16541 TAMPA PALMS BLVD W, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Todd Connolly

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (73%) 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Chiles Elementary School

16541 TAMPA PALMS BLVD W, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a nurturing and safe environment in which all children aspire to become tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become the district's leader in developing successful students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Connolly, Todd	Principal	Oversee the day to day operations of Chiles Elementary School including both the facilities operation as well as the instructional leader of Chiles Elementary.
Hernandez, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Kindergarten and SAC chair for 2022-2023
Marsh, Alishia	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of Kindergarten and SAC Chair for 2022-2023

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2009, Todd Connolly

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

856

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

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	118	138	149	159	173	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	863
Attendance below 90 percent	0	31	21	13	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	124	144	162	167	121	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	865
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	8	6	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	19	20	18	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	124	144	162	167	121	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	865
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	8	6	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	19	20	18	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	78%	53%	56%				82%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	74%						70%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						64%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	83%	50%	50%				85%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	82%						81%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						66%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	59%	59%				85%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	76%	52%	24%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	57%	28%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2022					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	81%	51%	30%	53%	28%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	45	57	47	71	70	65	36				
ELL	82	80	62	86	83	70	67				
ASN	90	84		97	80		94				
BLK	54	62	54	66	73	65	35				
HSP	81	76	83	77	87	70	72				
MUL	75	80		82	87						
WHT	83	71	40	88	84	61	82				
FRL	64	68	58	69	73	67	39				

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	35	42	30	40	42	36	27				
ELL	77	76	73	85	76		53				
ASN	93	89		96	83		83				
BLK	53	60		58	50		41				
HSP	80	59		80	56	40	58				
MUL	74			84							
WHT	85	59	30	84	68		75				
FRL	61	58	42	63	52	35	47				
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	41	48	33	55	60	67	62				
ELL	63	71	72	82	77	57	86				
ASN	85	91		94	95		96				
BLK	79	62	45	72	77	71	77				
HSP	75	62	59	83	70	58	74				
MUL	81	76		73	81	64	77				
WHT	87	65	64	90	82	65	90				
FRL	71	66	58	76	76	63	78				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	78
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	81
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

Our trend data shows that students in our bottom quartile need to show improvement in both ELA and Mathematics. Special attention should be focused around our students with disabilities and ELL populations.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Focus around our lowest 25% of students in ELA and mathematics with particular attention focused on our students with disabilities and ELL populations.

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

We will focus on improving our core instruction, small group instruction, differentiating and scaffolding instruction as needed. We will focus on rigorous core instruction and ensure the fidelity of small group, differentiation, and acceleration to help foster academic engagement of all students. We will focus on frequent progress monitoring of all students with an intensive lens on students in the bottom quartile with varying exceptionalities.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We improved in our math instruction at all grade levels. We also saw improvement in science data.

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

Implemented monthly math assessments, we utilized this data during our planning sessions and PLC's to identify strengths and areas to improve student by student.

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

Active engagement centered around rigorous instruction, acceleration activities that support classroom instruction and not remediation, fluid small groups with accountability.

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

We will work with district staff to complete training around The 5 Practices book to improve mathematics instruction.

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

VE teachers and general education teachers will meet more frequently through PLC's to engage in looking at student work and performance on assessment data.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

At Chiles Elementary, student achievement will increase when we have a focus on core instruction, small group instruction, differentiated instruction, and scaffolding for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

We will grow the percent of bottom quartile students making learning gains, by 10%. Our ELA BQ will increase from 56% to 66% and our MATH BQ will increase from 66% to 76%.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

We will focus on frequent progress monitoring of all students with an intensive lens on students in the bottom quartile and students with varying exceptionalities. Administration will monitor the fidelity of interventions, ensuring bottom quartile students engage with on grade level materials. Opportunities for collaboration between VE teachers and general education teachers will be provided through PLC's. Our PLC's will meet weekly to ensure fidelity of analyzing data and planning for instruction with current real time data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Connolly (todd.connolly@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Progress monitoring of all students with real time in the moment data. Using current assessment data to make immediate instructional decisions and setting goals with students to further improve their assessment data.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

We have streamlined our processes to allow for real time data monitoring, active analysis of data through our Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), planning future learning opportunities based on current assessment data and establishing student goal setting to ensure all of our students improve in the areas of ELA and Math.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We have worked with our Steering committees and leadership team to revamp our School Wide Behavior Management Plan. Our plan is geared towards positive recognition of student behaviors through our spotlight on Kindness, our monthly guidance lessons are designed around a monthly character trait and students are selected by their class to receive the student of the month recognition. Students also receive academic recognitions through our brag tag/report card awards that take place quarterly.

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

Grade level teachers, administration, student services are all instrumental in ensuring that Chiles elementary is consistently promoting a positive school culture.