

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cimino Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Cimino Elementary School

4329 CULBREATH RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To maximize student potential and provide them with the knowledge, skills and character necessary to be prepared for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a top performing school in Hillsborough County.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Griffiths, Joanne	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others to ensure the overall implementation of problem-solving strategies and high-quality instructional practices.
Fiorita, Anne	Assistant Principal	Collaborates and problem solves to ensure the implementation of high-quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process. Supports the implementation of high-quality instructional practices at the core (Tier1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2&3) levels. Reviews ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goals in curricular, behavioral and attendance domains. Communicates school-wide data to PLC's and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.
Bird, Madison	SAC Member	Supports the implementation of school improvement plan strategies by seeking input and consensus from stakeholders. Communicates problem-solving strategies within the content/grade level teams.
Ambrosino, Meghan	Other	Supports the implementation of intervention/enrichment strategies. Ensures the fidelity of IEP instructional practices and facilitates the RtI/MTSS process.
Beerens, Staci	School Counselor	Facilitates the RtI/MTSS process and provides school wide behavioral guidance and counseling support.
cristobal-madrid, sabrina	Attendance/Social Work	Ensures the implementation of attendance monitoring procedures and provides support to remove barriers to educational access for all stakeholders.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholder involvement and SIP Development included a process of reviewing school wide progress monitoring data. All stakeholders worked together to analyze the data and compare the data to district and state results. After reviewing the data trends, instructional teams highlighted best practices that were implemented to impact student learning. Enrichment strategies were identified for academic areas that need to be improved.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School improvement strategies will be regularly monitored within grade level PLC planning meetings and RtI/MTSS problem-solving sessions. Ongoing review of progress monitoring data will be the focus of each meeting. Academic committees will engage in problem-solving planning sessions to revise the plan, as necessary to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	15	22	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	11	27	0	0	0	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	12	8	6	15	4	6	0	0	0	51

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	23	29	14	20	21	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	5	2	3	1	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	23	29	14	20	21	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	5	2	3	1	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64	50	53	68	53	56	67		
ELA Learning Gains				63			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			50		
Math Achievement*	65	56	59	73	50	50	66		
Math Learning Gains				82			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			68		
Science Achievement*	59	50	54	62	59	59	58		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	59	59	63			59		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	57			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	50			
HSP	60			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	64			65			59					50
SWD	45			39			34				4	
ELL	37			68							3	50
AMI												
ASN	77			85							2	
BLK	39			32			23				3	
HSP	62			62			46				5	53
MUL	50			53			47				4	
PAC												
WHT	71			71			71				4	
FRL	49			50			40				5	50

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	63	41	73	82	67	62					63
SWD	42	49	31	51	64	62	31					
ELL	32	54	42	62	88	79	27					63
AMI												
ASN	70			90								
BLK	38	53		50	65	45						
HSP	60	52	38	63	82	74	44					65
MUL	70	85		55	70							
PAC												
WHT	76	65	40	84	86	82	77					
FRL	54	55	38	59	72	59	46					52

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	66	50	66	72	68	58					59
SWD	31	42	36	38	69	68	22					
ELL	46			42								59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	36		39	36							
HSP	59	65		51	50	60	32					50
MUL	62	80		62	90							
PAC												
WHT	75	67	50	76	81	71	68					
FRL	53	58	53	53	71	76	38					50

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	53%	13%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	46%	13%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	55%	7%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	59%	22%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	59%	53%	6%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	47%	11%	51%	7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Cimino Elementary School progress monitoring data from STARR and FASST in each grade level reflects inconsistent growth. In both Math and ELA, while primary grades had initial high levels of proficiency, intermediate grades 3-5 showed inconsistent growth and limited gains for bottom quartile as well as high performing students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

During the past school year, primary grades were still navigating and aligning strategies with new standards, curriculum resources, and progress monitoring assessments. Intermediate grades experienced the same factors and they had less time and experience with these instructional changes.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

4th grade math had the greatest difference when compared to the state average. Cimino 4th grade math proficiency percentile for PM3 was 80% compared to the state at 61%. Consistent implementation of

iReady progress monitoring and individualized instruction contributed to the significant difference in proficiency levels.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The comparable data focused on proficiency levels in Math from PM1 to PM3 is as follows: 3rd grade 16%-61%, 4th grade 21%-80%, and 5th grade 14%-59%. In ELA, the comparable data from PM1 to PM3 is as follows; 3rd grade 30% 60%, 4th grade 54% - 68%, and 5th grade 37% to 66%. In the area of science performance, 5th grade's comparative data from PM1 to PM3, and SSA 2022 to 2023 SSA decreased.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Cimino's two Areas of Concern are in ELA and Science academic performance.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Cimino's highest priorities include ELA instruction focused on building vocabulary across the content areas with an emphasis in science informational text.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA proficient Level 3-5 students did not make significant gains from PM1 to PM3. A majority of students in the bottom quartile at Level 1 did not improve. In Kindergarten, students scored at the lower range for growth. In grades 3 and 5, Level 4's and 5's dropped, and in 4th grade, 46% of Level 1 students did not make gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

50% of students in all performance Levels 1 - 5 will make gains in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Dibels, iReady and Wonders Checkpoint assessments will be implemented to monitor student performance gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joanne Griffiths (joanne.griffiths@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implement UFLI strategies focused on foundational skills instruction aligned to the science of reading in grades K-2.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Core instruction in the Science of Reading will build the foundational skills that students need to become effective readers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional Development training in the use of data protocols to support teachers in data driven decision making.

Coaching support within PLC's to facilitate the use of instructional frameworks that support teachers in the structure of the literacy block and their use of core and supplemental resources in both whole group and small group instruction.

Schedule common planning time to support teacher understanding of benchmarks and instructional strategies to best meet the needs of their students.

Increase engagement in the Tier 1/ Core curriculum that is aligned to the standards by delivering instruction within the foundational skills, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing using both Wonders and UFLI for K-5 students.

Person Responsible: Joanne Griffiths (joanne.griffiths@hcps.net)

By When: Action steps will be ongoing beginning with preplanning training and continuous data collection and analysis year-round to support student learning.

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 5th grade, 58% of students demonstrated proficiency on PM3 in the past year. This was a significant decrease from student proficiency of 75% on PM1.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on Science achievement data trends over prior years, Cimino plans to achieve a 70% proficiency rate on the end of year science assessment.

Monitoring:

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

K-5 Science Progress Monitoring Plan

Form 1 - 3 Administered in the Beginning, Middle and End of the Year

-Common Mini Unit Assessments Administered K-5 (As needed)

-Quarterly Assessments Administered with Fidelity to Monitor Mastery of Each Quarter

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will provide experiences that allow students to apply science process skills by posing questions to promote scientific discussion and opportunities for students to identify additional wonderings for future investigations.

Students will have opportunities to collect and analyze data and identify patterns and trends. Teachers will ensure that students are engaged in targeted tasks based upon the collected evidence of learning and students' instructional needs.

Monitoring student work and questioning and modeling thinking where appropriate to move learning forward

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Delivering high quality lessons rooted in content vocabulary and collaborative learning followed by teachers analyzing and using student data to plan instruction will significantly improve student learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All grades will conduct Long-Term Investigations prior to beginning each unit to explore the content and build vocabulary.

Implement the instructional Frameworks with fidelity.

Utilize a common rubric to monitor student progress.

Science vocabulary and process skills are displayed in all classrooms.

Evidence of STEM visible in each classroom.

Person Responsible: Joanne Griffiths (joanne.griffiths@hcps.net)

By When: Science instruction will be embedded in ongoing daily lessons throughout the school year to include monthly LTI's and weekly STEM activities.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Results from the Spring 2023 Panorama Student Survey reflect a significant decrease in the perception of the overall social and learning climate of the school from 68% favorable in Fall 2022 to 60% favorable in Spring 2023. Each question in this area of the survey showed a decrease in percent favorable. Questions range from fairness of the school rules to how the behavior of other students impacts personal learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In Fall of 2020, School Climate student responses had a 72% favorable rate compared to 60% favorable rate in Fall 2022. Our goal is to achieve a 70% favorable rate in Spring 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Results of the Fall 2023 Panorama Survey will establish baseline data that can be monitored for improvement throughout the year using a similar perception inventory. The Spring 2024 rating will determine the success of the evidence-based interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joanne Griffiths (joanne.griffiths@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Character In Action/Cougar Pledge: As a student at Cimino, I pledge to be safe, be kind, and be an active participant in my learning.

Each grade (or teacher) creates lessons to specifically and explicitly teach each of the parts of the Cougar pledge. This would include why we have this rule and how it looks with examples and non-examples.

Classroom behavior management lessons and structures will include instruction in the Zones of Regulation and implementation of classroom and schoolwide positive reinforcement systems.

Schedule daily Morning Meetings in each classroom to hear about the student's experience and perspective, know them as individuals, be responsive to their needs, learn from them for the benefit of the class and school, and build relational trust.

Empower students with practical strategies to respond to bullying through role-play and reflection.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This activity is designed to be engaging and educational, providing students with the tools and confidence to respond effectively to bullying. By practicing in a safe and supportive classroom setting, students are empowered to take positive actions in their daily lives.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

The student character expectations are to be used when managing classroom behaviors. Teachers and staff are expected to explicitly teach/model these expectations to help students learn how to show character.

Teach character/behavior by identifying the learning target and outcomes students are expected to know and demonstrate.

Classroom expectations and the Cougar Pledge should be displayed in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Staci Beerens (staci.beerens@hcps.net)

By When: Cimino's Character in Action Plan is expected to be taught throughout the school year.