

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Maniscalco K 8 School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Maniscalco K 8 School

939 DEBUEL RD, Lutz, FL 33549

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Tammy Reale**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (75%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Maniscalco K 8 School

939 DEBUEL RD, Lutz, FL 33549

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	No	83%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>  <b>Grade</b>	<b>2021-22</b>  A	<b>2020-21</b>  B	<b>2019-20</b>  B	<b>2018-19</b>  B
---------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

## 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.**

Maniscalco will provide a nurturing and safe learning environment to develop lifelong learners.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Maniscalco will rank in the top 10% of Hillsborough Elementary and Middle Schools.

### 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
Reale, Tammy	Principal	Staff and Student Needs
Wonderley, Marni	School Counselor	Student Services Support
Hall, Katie	SAC Member	SAC Chair
Bell, Carmelita	School Counselor	Student Services Support
Carr, Sharnel	Assistant Principal	Student and Staff Needs
Franchino, Jerry	Assistant Principal	Staff and Student Needs

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/7/2022, Tammy Reale

**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.*

7

**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.*

12

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

67

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

602

**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.**

8

**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	27	78	64	64	75	64	72	53	58	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	16	13	11	14	11	11	9	6	10	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	2	8	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	8	9	9	8	7	4	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	10	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	16	22	8	9	9	8	7	4	0	0	0	0	89

**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	1	0	0	3	0	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	11

**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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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**

Thursday 7/7/2022



**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	61	78	91	74	81	89	66	53	62	0	0	0	0	655
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	12	9	3	9	5	10	10	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	15	6	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	14	15	12	6	12	9	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	83

**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	1	0	0	1	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	3	6	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	61	78	91	74	81	89	66	53	62	0	0	0	0	655
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	12	9	3	9	5	10	10	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	15	6	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	14	15	12	6	12	9	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	83

**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	1	0	0	1	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	3	6	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	67%	51%	55%				60%	57%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						62%	56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						63%	52%	54%
Math Achievement	75%	41%	42%				65%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	79%						62%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%						60%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	61%	48%	54%				54%	50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	84%	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	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2022					
	2019	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
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	63%	54%	9%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
	2019	55%	54%	1%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
06	2022					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2022					
	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%				

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					
2019					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					
2019					

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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	31	60	66	45	65	77	28	54			
ELL	51	70	63	56	68	75	47				
ASN	80			80							
BLK	63	66	73	59	80	67	56	80			
HSP	64	72	59	77	79	82	63	88	100		
MUL	53	77		68	77						
WHT	73	70	64	77	78	64	57	83			
FRL	62	69	68	68	77	77	54	82	100		
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	24	37	39	39	42	38	10	17			
ELL	43	58	78	50	51	47	27				
ASN	71	60		79	60						
BLK	55	48	54	45	41	27	42				
HSP	54	62	65	59	45	44	51	57	82		
MUL	59	46		64	23						
WHT	65	54	45	65	51	42	51	60	78		
FRL	52	53	56	51	42	38	44	58	79		
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	25	40	43	33	61	63	11				
ELL	46	72	92	59	81	83					
ASN	75			83							

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
BLK	42	67		46	57						
HSP	58	64	62	60	64	60	53				
MUL	60			67							
WHT	64	65	68	71	62	62	55				
FRL	58	63	65	59	61	60	52				

**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	74
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	736
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	62
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	80
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	68
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	75
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	69
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	71
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	72
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?**

Across grade levels the economically disadvantaged and the students with disabilities showed a lower level of proficiency compared to the overall grade levels in most academic areas according to the progress monitoring data for 2021-2022 school year. Overall math scores have shown improvement in proficiency, bottom quartile, and learning gains for the 2021-2022 school year. As a school we would like to see ELA scores show the same level of improvement as we have seen in math scores for the 2021-2022 school year. There are significant increases in civics and science scores for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Our Middle school ELA (grades 6-8) show the greatest need for improvement according to the 2021-2022 school year data. They had a small decline in academic success compared to other grade levels which showed improvement in academic areas for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Lack of foundational skills and loss of instruction due to the pandemic were contributing factors in the areas that need improvement. Intense skill, acceleration, and instructional based small groups need to be implemented to address these needs for improvement.

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

Grades 3-8 showed the most improvement in math proficiency, learning gain, and bottom quartile for the 2021-2022 school year. Science and Civics both also showed significant academic gains for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

As a school we began ELP, Lunch Bunches, and Fill Your Bucket Friday (Middle School intervention) earlier in the 2021-2022 school year. This year we began groups in October versus previous years we began in January. Leadership and other instructional support staff had intervention groups in grade levels to meet the needs of the bottom quartile. Middle School used a strategy of across content area support to meet the needs of students that were below level in multiple content areas. All grade levels utilized iReady Reading and Math for the 2021-2022 school year for both remediation and acceleration.

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

All grade levels will have monthly data monitoring meetings with administration and support staff to address individual student needs. Small group instruction will be utilized daily in all grade levels and academic areas. There will be a focus on district created instructional calendars to meet all curriculum needs for the 2021-2022 school year.

**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 begin the 2022-2023 school year with a Restorative Practices training as a school to help improvement student and staff success. Leadership will be presenting a training on the new teacher evaluation/feedback system for the 2022-2023 school year to prepare teachers and set them up for success. There will be monthly ILT meetings with instructional leaders from all grade levels where student work will be discussed and strategies implemented for improvement. Grade level data chats and PLCs to identify individual and grade level student needs. Content specific vertical champion meetings with representation from all grade levels to focus on instructional needs. Teacher driven monthly professional development opportunities to provide opportunities for instructional growth.

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

Administrative walkthroughs and feedback to help support teachers meet professional standards. Monthly job embedded professional development opportunities on school site.

**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 Small Group Instruction**

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

Our focus is active student engagement strategies across all curriculum with a laser focus on bottom quartile students, subgroups, and students with disabilities.

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

Improve student performance for the bottom quartile in all grades and content areas. Focus on learning gains and bottom quartile gains ELA to align with math growth.

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

Monthly grade level and content specific data meetings with administration and support staff.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

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

Small group instruction, differentiated instruction, standard based objectives, standard based lesson plans and instruction, monthly PLCs, collaborative data conversations, AVID strategies implemented in all grade levels, ILT, MTSS, school-wide behavior plan, professional book studies, parent and student curriculum involvement, administrative feedback to instructional staff, technology and resources for instruction.

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

School-wide systems for small groups that develops teachers and increase student engagement and learning gains for all students.

**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***

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

Our focus is strategic progress monitoring to track individual student achievement to include monitoring data using count sheets, i-Ready, collaborative curriculum conversations, and student work along with collaborative planning and PLCs to ensure individual student academic gains.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We need to increase student performance in the sub group of economically disadvantaged students.  
Improve student performance for the bottom quartile in all grades and content areas.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monthly grade level and content specific data meetings with administration and support staff.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Small group instruction, differentiated instruction, standard based objectives, standard based lesson plans and instruction, monthly PLCs, collaborative data conversations, AVID strategies implemented in all grade levels, ILT, MTSS, school-wide behavior plan, professional book studies, parent and student curriculum involvement, administrative feedback to instructional staff, technology and resources for instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

School-wide systems for collaborative planning that develops teachers and increase student engagement and learning gains for all students.

**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 will utilize the feedback results from the Insight Survey to work on a positive school culture and environment. Our ILT team will meet monthly and climate and culture will be worked on through this committee. We will continue with the school-wide behavior committee (PRIDE) that we established last year. Changes will be made to school wide professional development to meet the needs of a K-8 school. We will also have Literacy Night, Math/Science Night, local business and restaurant partnerships, Spirit Nights involving the local community, PTSA Newsletters, school-wide weekly parent links, midterm progress reports, volunteers working with students, school website, NEJHS, NJHS, and student council active in the community. Administration will collaborate with the student council on new initiatives throughout the school year.

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

Grade Level Teachers and Team Leaders  
 School-wide Administration  
 School-wide Support Services Team  
 Mustang PRIDE Committee Chairs  
 PTSA  
 Maniscalco K-8 Student Body  
 NEJHS President  
 NJHS President  
 Student Council Leaders for each Grade Level