Collins Pk 8 School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Collins Pk 8 School

12424 SUMMERFIELD BLVD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Sargable

Start Date for this Principal: 4/27/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	49%
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: B (60%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: 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	ATSI
* 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

Collins Pk 8 School

12424 SUMMERFIELD BLVD, Riverview, FL 33579

[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)
Combination School PK-8	No	49%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		C	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.

Collins Elementary students will be compassionate, respectful, responsible learners who become successful citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

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
Sargable, Rebecca	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Smiley, Ron	Assistant Principal	Serves as the assistant instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 4/27/2015, Rebecca Sargable

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.*
3

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.*
18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
71

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,002

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

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	143	154	187	141	188	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	975
Attendance below 90 percent	2	34	42	30	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	34	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	33	34	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	15	0	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	1	2	3	0	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	1	2	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	126	175	136	173	139	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	932
Attendance below 90 percent	37	38	32	21	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	22	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	31	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	78	38	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	10	9	13	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
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	126	175	136	173	139	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	932
Attendance below 90 percent	37	38	32	21	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	22	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	31	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	78	38	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	10	9	13	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
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	60%	51%	55%				58%	57%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	65%						55%	56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						41%	52%	54%
Math Achievement	62%	41%	42%				56%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	73%						44%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						26%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	55%	48%	54%				57%	50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		57%	59%					77%	78%

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	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	55%	0%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	60%	54%	6%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	56%	51%	5%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	29	51	49	24	48	52	29				
ELL	42	47		47	63		36				
ASN	91			100							
BLK	44	55	52	42	64	60	40				
HSP	58	56	29	60	67	44	53				
MUL	74	67		68	72		57				
WHT	67	76	76	71	80	52	64				
FRL	49	56	46	44	64	53	40				

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	19	33	39	30	35	47	14				
ELL	34			47							
BLK	36	40	36	27	32		14				
HSP	52	41	36	50	52	57	41				
MUL	57			50			27				
WHT	69	62		62	64	60	55				
FRL	43	39	35	37	47	45	30				

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	16	39	35	19	26	25	9				
ELL	27	31	17	40	25	13	27				
ASN	65	57		76	50						
BLK	47	53	43	42	39	25	44				
HSP	58	56	36	59	42	31	56				
MUL	58	69		58	46						
WHT	64	56	41	60	47	19	68				
FRL	49	54	42	46	40	27	48				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	96
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	51
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	54
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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	69
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	52
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?

The Federal Index for our Students with Disabilities is 40%, which falls below the expectation of 41%.
Our BQ learning gains for ELA and Math were just above 50%, which shows a trend of growth in our school.
Our Learning gains in ELA (65%) and Math (73%), which continues to show a trend of growth in our school and with our students.

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

Based on the 2022 State Assessment data our greatest areas for improvement are
SWD ELA proficiency (29%), Math proficiency (24%) and Science proficiency (29%)
ESSA subgroups (SWD 40%)
BQ Learning gains (ELA - 51%, Math - 53%)

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

Some of the contributing factors was trying to reteach and build a stamina for learning in the classroom after a couple of years of various modes of instruction (virtual learning, homeschooled students, etc).
Gaps in foundational skills in the area of early reading, vocabulary and comprehension continue to

contribute to learning struggles in all core academic areas. New math standards and a gap year in resources was also a factor in the need for improvement in some of our subgroups.
We need to align tasks for our SWD and BQ learners in order to ensure they are making progress throughout the year to show proficiency on the state assessment , progress monitoring three.
Providing foundational skills within all academic areas to provide support for gaps in learning will help impact the overall knowledge of our SWD and BQ learners.

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

Based on the 2022 State assessment data our greatest area of improvement was Math Learning Gains which improved from 53% to 73%.

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

Successful implementation of Math Monthlies across all grade levels contributed to this improvement. Some of our new actions will continuing to utilize the Math Quarterly Assessments, as well as using Unit Assessments to progress monitor. Utilizing the new Stemscopes curriculum in alignment with the Math Standards will support continued progress.

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

Using effective Grade Level PLC practices to:
* Discuss Knowledge of Standards and Foundational Skills to ensure core and small group lessons are aligned to BEST standards
* Analyze Grade and class level data on learned units of study
* Monitor student progress through Tier 1 instruction, and Tier 2 and 3 interventions using aggressive progress monitoring
* Maintain relationships/connections

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 offered on site through TTDs and PDS (district)
Monthly professional development based on school/teacher needs offered on the monthly Monday PD
Research based articles shared with staff weekly.
Teacher Talent Developments available for individual, group, grade level, and school support.
District provided instructional guides, learning paths, and activities
Resources provided through Staff Hub, Canvas, and Academic Services Notebook in OneNote

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

Clear Instructional Priorities
7 Mindsets SEL program
School wide Look Fors within the classroom and feedback
Scheduled PLCs
Progress Monitoring

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Using the 2022 FSA data our SWD learners were: Proficient in ELA: 29% Proficient in Math: 24% Proficient in Science: 29% ***can add PM 1 data after testing
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	62% of our Kindergarten through 5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency on PM3 of the state assessment in May 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor the SWD subgroup through progress monitoring of unit assessments, standards aligned tasks, and district created assessments. Utilizing scheduled PLCS we can discuss trends teachers and grade levels are noticing to plan standards aligned tasks and lessons for both core and small group.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ron Smiley (ron.smiley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will utilize math Quarterly Assessments (district), ELA Spotlight Benchmarks and Unit Assessments (district), and the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking PM 1 and PM 2 to monitor our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	District created Assessments (Math Quarterly and ELA Spotlight Benchmark and Unit Assessments) have targeted goals to assess what students have previously learned in classroom instruction and teachers can monitor student learning through these assessments.

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.

Assist in providing differentiated professional development for the implementing of the B.E.S.T standards via the utilization of the assessments provided by the district.

Person Responsible	Ron Smiley (ron.smiley@hcps.net)

Grade levels will utilize bi-monthly PLCs to analyze student data, track student progress and discuss standards aligned tasks to promote students learning.

Person Responsible	Ron Smiley (ron.smiley@hcps.net)

#2. 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.	Based on 2022 state assessment data Our lowest 25th percentile (BQ) in both ELA and math were slightly above 50%, which was the lowest percentage among all groups tested.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	62% of K-5 students will show proficiency on the stage assessment by PM 3 in Spring 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor our BQ students in both ELA and Math through progress monitoring of unit assessments, standards aligned tasks, and district created assessments. Utilizing scheduled PLCS we can discuss trends teachers and grade levels are noticing to plan standards aligned tasks and lessons for both core and small group.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will utilize math Quarterly Assessments (district), ELA Spotlight Benchmarks and Unit Assessments (district), and the Florida state assessment PM 1 and PM 2 to monitor our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	District created Assessments (Math Quarterly and ELA Spotlight Benchmark and Unit Assessments) have targeted goals to assess what students have previously learned in classroom instruction and teachers can monitor student learning through these assessments.

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.

Assist in providing differentiated professional development for the implementing of the B.E.S.T standards via the utilization of the assessments provided by the district.

Person Responsible	Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

Grade levels will utilize scheduled PLCs to create standards aligned tasks for both core and small group that are based on student need. These lessons, tasks, and assessment will be differentiated to provide support for a gap in foundational skills in all core content areas.

Person Responsible	Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

Using ELA and math data, teachers will provide interventions to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students which will help close the gap in foundational skills for our BQ learners to help them reach proficiency.

Person Responsible	Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

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.

Collins Elementary continues to create a positive school culture and safe environment in many ways. Our school uses the 7 Mindsets curriculum and participates in the Anchored for Life Program. We have a school-wide mentoring program as well as social-skills groups held by the guidance department. We have also implemented a "positive referral" system to recognize students who demonstrate behavior that has a positive impact on the school culture and environment.

We work to communicate every child's progress (alerts, conferences, phone calls) and encourage participation in school events (communicated through ParentLinks, newsletters, Facebook, Twitter, Remind App and our school website.)

Overall, the Collins team will focus on Social-Emotional learning, through the continued implementation of the 7 mindsets curriculum, to ensure a safe, caring environment where all stakeholders feel emotionally , socially, and physically safe.

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

Every stakeholder associated with our school (faculty, staff, volunteers, parents, students, community members, etc.) are responsible for actively engaging in and promoting a positive school culture and safe environment.