

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Ferrell Middle Magnet 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

Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cara Diehl

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (63%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: 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	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

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

Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

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.

We empower our girls to excel in rigorous academics and character education while fostering them to be positive forces in our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Developing confident, dynamic, educated young women.

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
Diehl, Cara	Principal	
White, Carla	Assistant Principal	
Cason, Shayla	Administrative Support	
Turner, Eric	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Cara Diehl

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.*

6

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

439

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

3

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

3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	76	145	0	0	0	0	438	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	22	0	0	0	0	62	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	0	0	0	0	28	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	32	0	0	0	0	52	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	25	0	0	0	0	47	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	32	0	0	0	0	52	

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	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	7	6	0	0	0	0	30

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/26/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	154	166	0	0	0	0	446
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	31	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	26	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	46	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	26	0	0	0	0	47

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	21	37	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	0	24

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	154	166	0	0	0	0	446
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	31	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	26	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	46	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	26	0	0	0	0	47

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	21	37	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	0	24	

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	51%	50%	50%				53%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						60%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						58%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	60%	36%	36%				62%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	74%						72%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%						75%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	52%	53%				43%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	58%	58%				75%	67%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	51%	53%	-2%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	52%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	48%	49%	-1%	55%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	65%	62%	3%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	31%	13%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	43%	47%	-4%	48%	-5%
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	75%	67%	8%	71%	4%
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	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	90%	57%	33%	57%	33%

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	12	32	33	24	47	47	10				
ELL	38	46	38	57	74	65	24	67			
BLK	42	48	40	49	67	72	35	79	100		
HSP	54	50	36	64	76	70	56	76	95		
MUL	77	45		82	75			100			
WHT	60	59		86	91		64	81	100		
FRL	44	46	37	54	72	71	37	80	98		
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	25	30	13	30	26	14	28			
ELL	42	49	48	37	44	43	21	48			
BLK	41	42	38	35	50	49	23	55	65		
HSP	57	55	49	53	50	36	36	67	75		
MUL	59	59		68	72		27				
WHT	72	65		67	48		67	84	95		
FRL	48	49	43	43	51	48	28	60	70		
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	15	44	47	28	58	74	12	32			
ELL	33	55	59	58	80	82	25	67			
BLK	45	55	55	55	66	76	38	72	88		
HSP	52	62	65	67	76	70	47	69	90		
MUL	58	68		58	76						
WHT	74	65	46	76	82	77	58	86	95		
FRL	48	58	57	58	70	74	37	69	91		

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	63
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	64
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	76
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	77
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	60
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?

6th Grade historically is making lower gains than 7th and 8th grade in both ELA and Math.

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

ELA Achievement of proficiency
 ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%
 Science Achievement of 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?

We hope to focus on differentiating instruction to meet the needs of the learners along with challenging them with an appropriate level of work.

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

Learning gains in math for all grade level
Algebra EOC proficiency
Civics achievement of proficiency

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

Targeted skills support, small group support, intensive math support with collaborative planning with teachers.

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

Differentiated support in ELA
Small group support in ELA
Reading support in 8th-grade Science

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.

On-going training to support differentiated instruction. Monthly Professional Learning Committees that focus on the HCPS Instructional framework model.

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

Utilizing our success coaches and magnet lead teacher to support tier interventions and training of teachers in differentiated instruction.

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 Differentiation

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Differentiation, including small group instruction, can positively impact our learning gain and sub-group data

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

If we effectively progress monitor student learning, and plan differentiated instruction that support standards-based instruction then:
 The percent of students achieving proficiency on

- FSA ELA will increase from 51% to 56%,
- FSA Math will increase from 60% to 65%
- Civics EOC will increase from 81% to 86%
- SSA will increase from 45 to 50%

Student learning gains in:

- ELA will increase from 50% to 60%,
- Math will increase from 74% to 80%
- BQ ELA learning gains will increase from 38% to 55%.
- BQ Math learning gains will increase from 72% to 80%

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

Progress monitoring reading data will be monitored twice a quarter by ILT
 Success Coach and Lead Magnet Teacher will facilitate Level 3 interventions (review monthly)
 Differentiation strategies will be implemented per semester by PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cara Diehl (cara.diehl@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented

Differentiation

**for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

**Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for
selecting this
specific
strategy.**

**Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this strategy.**

Differentiated instruction is an approach whereby teachers adjust their curriculum and instruction to maximize the learning of all students: average learners, English language learners, struggling students, students with learning disabilities, and gifted and talented students. Differentiated instruction is not a single strategy but rather a framework that teachers can use to implement a variety of strategies, many of which are evidence-based. These evidence-based strategies include: Employing effective classroom management procedures, Grouping students for instruction (especially students with significant learning problems), Assessing readiness, and teaching to the student's zone of proximal development. (Iris.Peabody.Vanderbilt.edu)

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.

Implement PLC collaborative planning to support progress monitoring of student learning and implementation of differentiated instruction.

Calendar out common assessments in core content to drive instruction.

Core content training on HCPS Instructional Frameworks. Focus on small groups. Will be monitored in PLCs on a monthly basis.

**Person
Responsible** Cara Diehl (cara.diehl@hcps.net)

Bi-Weekly implementation of reading support in LA/Reading classes. Data will be monitored in PLCs and ILT Monthly.

**Person
Responsible** Cara Diehl (cara.diehl@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

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 work to communicate every student's progress to the parents/guardians by sending home bi-weekly progress reports and holding quarterly Student Led Conferences. School staff, students, parents, and the community work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. Our goal is to build positive relationships with families. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by communicating through ParentLink, Canvas, school website. We facilitate the annual Mother Daughter Day Event and Father Daughter Dance to provide unique family experiences on our school campus. We have a success coach that works with both students and parents on having a successful transition to middle and high school.

Examples of Events: Open House, Hispanic Heritage Month Saturday School Celebration, SAC Mtgs, Parent Link, Conference Nights, Volunteer Orientation/Recognition, Great American Teach-In, Parent Workshop: Transition to Middle School, Cyber-bullying.

Furthermore, being a Cambridge International School, Ferrell implements a whole-school Global Perspective

Challenges each semester. These challenges will focus on the 5 Cambridge Learner Attributes with a strong focus on collaboration.

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

Students - follow the school Creed and HCPS Student Code of Conduct.

Staff - follow through with ongoing communication with students and parents/guardians.

Parents - actively support students and engage in open communication with staff.

Student Success Coaches - implement/facilitate Restorative Practices

Magnet Lead teacher - implement/facilitate Global Perspective Challenges