

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mort 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

Mort Elementary School

1806 E BEARSS AVE, Tampa, FL 33613

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Snellgrove

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: D (38%) 2017-18: C (50%)
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

Mort Elementary School

1806 E BEARSS AVE, Tampa, FL 33613

[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 PK-5	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	94%

School Grades History

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

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.

Mort Elementary engages families and partners to provide services that inspire the community to ensure students excel as successful and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the district's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Mort Elementary will create an innovative environment which empowers students, encourages parents, enriches families, and elevates the community.

Tagline: "Uniting the community today to nurture the leaders of tomorrow."

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
Hailey-Brown, Latiecea	Principal	Maintain direction of the school as a community school
Bhagwandeem-Girwarnath, Sangeeta	Teacher, K-12	
Snellgrove, Kelly	Assistant Principal	
Kontra, Kristen	Math Coach	Support Math instruction via side by side coaching and professional development.
Dyer, Jamie	Reading Coach	Supports literacy across all grade levels via side by side coaching.
Richards, Stacy	Instructional Coach	Supports interventions and writing literacy

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2022, Kelly Snellgrove

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.*

4

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

737

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

1

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

4

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	108	104	116	164	122	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	738
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	1	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	86	41	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	81	50	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	37	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/1/2022

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	100	128	133	163	121	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	785
Attendance below 90 percent	36	69	52	71	44	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
One or more suspensions	6	1	4	0	2	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	0	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	29	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	100	128	133	163	121	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	785
Attendance below 90 percent	36	69	52	71	44	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
One or more suspensions	6	1	4	0	2	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	0	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	29	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	31%	53%	56%				31%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						49%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						51%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	40%	50%	50%				35%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						38%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						36%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	59%	59%				29%	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	21%	52%	-31%	58%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2022					
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

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	34%	54%	-20%	62%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	30%	57%	-27%	64%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2022					
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	60%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	25%	51%	-26%	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	14	38	47	19	59	62	4				
ELL	31	49	49	40	70	61	24				
BLK	21	72	75	27	72	71	17				
HSP	33	52	44	43	69	59	31				
MUL	43			50							
WHT	33	80		46	58						
FRL	31	56	52	38	68	61	28				
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	30		18	43	47	16				
ELL	30	53	74	32	50	58	26				
BLK	24	38		14	24	27	5				
HSP	33	49	71	35	48	58	33				
WHT	32			21							
FRL	31	46	70	30	42	42	29				
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	5	42	56	14	32	42	8				
ELL	24	51	53	37	41	41	19				
BLK	22	37	47	26	27	30	19				
HSP	33	53	53	39	42	43	31				
MUL	55			36							
WHT	33	40		26	40						
FRL	31	49	52	36	39	38	28				

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	52
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	416
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	50
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	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	51
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	47
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	
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	54
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	51
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?

Over the past four years, our learning gains in ELA and MATH have increasingly shown improvement. In the area of ELA achievement, our school has scored 31% for the past 4 years.

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

Based on 2022 data, our bottom quartile across all areas was our lowest area.

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

Students not being retained in grade 3 (due to covid) who were promoted to 4th-grade are not being prepared for 4th grade standards and instruction.

Teachers need to better understand new benchmarks and how to differentiate instruction for students with deficits in multiple grades below to see growth.

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

All of our proficiencies went up. This was due to common planning aligned to direct instruction for tier 1. We were utilizing small group targeted instruction to fill gaps as well as to accelerate the needs/skills of students.

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

In addition, utilizing assessments to drive instruction through collaborative planning of teachers daily.

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

Grade levels will strategically plan lessons utilizing ALD-Academic Level Descriptors, academic benchmarks, and vertical progressions to meet students where they are at academically and accelerate their learning from there

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.

All teachers will be trained in the BEST standard for ELA and Math. In addition, there will be continuous ESE and ELL training to support our subgroups in the bottom quartile. Professional development will be based on the needs and trends witnessed in walkthrough data.

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

Small group intervention for 3rd grade retentions and other grade levels will be focused on to move students not on grade level as well as teachers being coached with a student centered focus.

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.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice specifically related to standards/benchmark aligned instruction.
Rationale: Walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark.

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

Increase walk-through grade level data by 80%
Based on ESSA data, Increase SWD student achievement by 10% in each area.

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

Conducting walkthroughs and fidelity checks
Coaching cycles
Use data from common and formative assessment to progress monitor student performance

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

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

Walkthroughs, common planning sessions, Professional Development

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

-Reflections and data(through conversations, coaching cycles, walkthroughs, and analyzing trends)

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.

5 by 5 Daily/Weekly walks
Followed by coaching cycles with classroom teachers

Person Responsible

Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

Common Collaborative planning to internalize standards and benchmarks

Person Responsible

Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@hcps.net)

Professional Development in all subject areas
Mini-Mondays
Tuesday Trends

Person Responsible

Latiecea Hailey-Brown (latiecea.hailey-brown@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

Area of Focus: Instructional practice specifically related to standards/benchmark aligned instruction.

Rationale: Walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark. Instructional Priority #1: Deliver content, concept, new resources or skill that is planned for and aligned to the standards/benchmark and intended learning outcome

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

Area of Focus: Instructional practice specifically related to standards/benchmark aligned instruction.

Rationale: Walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark. Instructional Priority #1: Deliver content, concept, new resources or skill that is planned for and aligned to the standards/benchmark and intended learning outcome

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)

K-2 expectation is that 50% of each grade level will reach grade level by the spring i-Ready diagnostic. Last year our Kindergarten was at 67% at grade level, first grade was 19% at grade level, and second grade was at 37% at grade level.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3-5 expectation is that 50% of each grade level will reach grade level by the spring i-Ready diagnostic. Last year our 3rd grade was at 43% at grade level, 4th grade was 38% at grade level, and 5th grade was 34% at grade level.

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.

Action Step: 5by5 Daily/Weekly Walks Evidence: Walkthroughs, planning sessions

Action Step: Common Collaborative Planning --> Internalize Standards and Benchmarks Evidence: Vocabulary, common language, classroom visuals, tools.

Action Step: Professional Development Evidence: Coaching cycles, Mini-Mondays, Tuesday Trends

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dyer, Jamie, jamie.dyer@hcps.net

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?

Planning with and walking through for look fors that include:

Teacher provides task aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark (R1)

Teacher provides a clear visual and/or example to model application of intended learning. (R3)

Teacher asks questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning (R11ELA R7 MATH)

Teacher uses academic language to support intended learning.

The students should be:

Students apply intended learning to complete assigned tasks. (r4)

Students use academic language through writing or discussion to deepen understanding (m12, m9, r6 math)

Expecting and Inspecting these in planning and practice should help to move all students closer to grade level.

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?

Hatties percentage of planning and predicting is a .78 This correlation is strong with student achievement and is why we are focusing on this as well as the implementation of what is being planned.

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
<p>Current Action Step supporting: Instructional practice specifically related to standards/ benchmark aligned instruction.</p> <p>-5by5 Daily/Weekly Walks</p> <p>-Common Collaborative Planning --> Internalize Standards and Benchmarks</p> <p>-Professional Development</p> <p>-For our SWD students, we will conduct weekly fidelity walks through ESE classrooms and provide additional support through ELP after school tutoring. Also data chats will concur with ESE teachers each quarter to closely monitor the growth of the SWD students.</p>	<p>Dyer, Jamie, jamie.dyer@hcps.net</p>

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.

Mort Elementary became a Community Partnership School during the 2015-2016 school year. The The Community Partnership Schools™ model involves the forming of a long-term partnership among at least

four core partners — a school district, a university or college, a community-based nonprofit, and a healthcare provider, as well as others. This comprehensive model of a community school leverages the social and institutional capital of the partners, making it possible for the school to offer resources and services that address the needs identified by the community.

We have built a strong student leadership program that we refer to as C.A.S.A. The program which was developed to support students' Character, Academics, Service, and Attendance. Creating a culture of togetherness and strength led by students. Along with this program is our school MORT's 22 Essentials, which embodies characteristics of Good Character. The program support all students and staff

within the building. The best part about the C.A.S.A house system is that the incentive program involves everyone in the school, teachers, custodial staff, cafeteria staff, and office staff. Students should understand that eyes are always watching and maintaining a consistent expectation in the school.

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

We have six core partners who have signed a long-term Memorandum of Agreement, making the commitment to work collaboratively to improve the Mort community as well as the lives of our students, staff, and families. Our core partners are Hillsborough County Public Schools, Children's Home Society, Tampa Family Health Centers, University of South Florida, Tampa Innovation Place, and University Area CDC. Along with our core MOA partners, we have a number of community business partners who support our efforts, including Publix, Bay Hope Church, Diamond View Studios, Bible-Based Church, Vistra Communications, DTCC, Straz Center for the Performing Arts, and Caspers.

Through these partnerships, supports are provided on the campus to help bridge the gaps and wrap our families in needed services, including a base of volunteers who assist with students, staff, and parents. Additional supports include clothing, meals, health and wellness services, increased parental involvement, and academic enrichment and tutoring, all of which release teachers and administrators to focus on academics.

The community partnership school's objective is to meet the social, emotional, mental, physical, nutritional and sometimes financial needs of students so they are ready and able to fully engage in the rigorous academic opportunities offered by their school.