Hernando County School District

Chocachatti Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Chocachatti Elementary School

4135 CALIFORNIA ST, Brooksville, FL 34604

https://www.hernandoschools.org/ces

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.

Our mission is to provide children with real life learning experiences that will enable them to become productive members of society, of worth to themselves and others, by encouraging academic growth while developing aesthetic values in the creative and performing arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Center for the Arts and MicroSociety is committed to providing a positive learning environment which integrates the creative abilities of children into the curriculum.

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
Silva, Lara	Principal	Academic Leader of the school and monitors all data.
Pagano, Nick	Assistant Principal	Support the teachers and principal. Monitors all data with a focus on discipline.
Lawson, Jennifer	Other	Monitors all tiered behavior and academics.
Doherty, Silvina	Magnet Coordinator	Monitors the microsociety academic program and data related to it.
Katcher, David	Other	Monitors all student data.
Baroudi, Becky	Teacher, K-12	Monitors kindergarten data.
Wilkerson, Christine	Teacher, K-12	Monitors all first grade data.
Holmlund, Chantel	Teacher, K-12	Monitors all second grade data.
Paolillo, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Monitors all third grade data.
Zack, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Monitors all fourth grade data.
Griffith, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Monitors all fifth grade data.

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.

Dana Squires - Parent/SAC Chair
Tracy Cox - Parent
Jackie Hernandez - Parent
Olivia Bard - Community
Jeanine Ciccarelli - Parent
Kara Dicaterino - Parent
Kisha Leopold - Parent
Sara Smith - Parent
Tiffany Sutton - Parent
Joanna Menzer - Parent
Elizabeth Almasy - Parent
Ronteryl Black - Parent

Lourdes Cardona - Parent
Menebre Chala - Parent
Tamara Holmes - Parent
Jennifer Mott - Parent
Bobbie Elmore - Parent
Vickie Elmore - Community
Airien Thomas - Support Staff
Rhonda Bowers - Teacher
Susan Viola - Teacher
Kathy Williams - Teacher
Lara Silva - Principal
Nick Pagano - Assistant Principal

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))

Core team meets weekly on Mondays from 9-10:30. We discuss testing and how students are performing. Leadership team meets monthly on Fridays from 3:30-4:30. We discuss data by grade level and problem solve barriers with the team. Faculty meetings are monthly during early release days. The meetings run from 1:00-3:45. We use this time to train faculty on new initiatives and discuss the effectiveness of their implementation.

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	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
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) 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: A
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	17	14	23	21	19	21	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	6	5	4	17	14	16	0	0	0	62
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	10	13	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	12	9	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	12	19	15	13	7	0	0	0	74

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	

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	5	3	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	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	18	18	7	6	6	7	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	24	2	5	10	17	1	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	5	7	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	5	4	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	15	14	11	6	6	0	0	0	63

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	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	18	18	7	6	6	7	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	24	2	5	10	17	1	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	5	7	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	5	4	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	15	14	11	6	6	0	0	0	63

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	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	65	50	53	73	51	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				60			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			40		
Math Achievement*	77	54	59	80	52	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				79			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			56		
Science Achievement*	65	56	54	63	53	59	57		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					48	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		71	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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	277
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	32	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	76			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	72			

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%
FRL	59			

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	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	64			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	66			

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	65			77			65					
SWD	33			33							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			55							2	
HSP	71			80			75				4	
MUL	48			57							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	68			80			65				4	
FRL	54			67			52				4	

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	73	60	46	80	79	68	63					
SWD	53			47								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			38								
HSP	76	57	33	79	77	64	64					
MUL	60			80								
PAC												
WHT	74	61	49	83	79	68	61					
FRL	66	57	47	79	82	78	56					

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	75	50	40	78	69	56	57					
SWD	23			31								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	76	46		72	74	70	52					
MUL	73	40		95	100		80					
PAC												
WHT	76	55	46	78	63	45	55					
FRL	68	48		69	68	58	60					

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%	56%	10%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	50%	21%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	83%	61%	22%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	55%	26%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	50%	24%	55%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	55%	10%	51%	14%

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.

CES's science proficiency is the lowest of all three tested areas. Our science data has increased only slightly over the course of three years. In 2021 we were 57% proficient, in 2022 we were 63% proficient, and in 2023 we were 65% proficient. Although we see an upward trend, we have not grown as much as ELA and math. The lack of explicit science instruction and time to conduct experiments have contributed to the slow growth. We have limited time and limited resources to teach quality science lessons each week.

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

Third grade ELA proficiency went down 7% from the previous year. This is an unusual amount of a drop for our school. We believe the change in proficiency is due to a change in the third grade teachers. They were new to this grade level and did not understand the rigor of the ELA curriculum.

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.

All of CES's data is higher than the state average levels. We are closest to the state average in science. We do not exceed the state average as highly in this subject area. We believe the factors that contribute to this is the change in teachers on the fifth grade team. The learning curve for this team will take time to master.

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

Our math scores school-wide show the most improvement. Our school implements the use of iReady daily for all k-5 students. Teachers use the program for the required 45 minutes per week. This dramatically increased our proficiency in math.

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

No concerns.

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

Increase proficiency in fifth grade science.
Increase application of science standards to the depth of the benchmarks.
Improve the teaching of science standards to higher levels of mastery.

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 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.

Our science proficiency does not match our ELA or math proficiency in all grades. Although our scores have increased, they are growing at a much slower rate. We know that our students are capable of much higher scores in this subject area. Our science scores are the closest to the state averages.

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

Our target is to increase science proficiency from 65% in 2023 to 70% in 2024 on the NGSSS state assessment in grade 5.

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

We will monitor the fifth grade progress with the NWEA/MAP assessment given 3 times a year to fifth grade students. Fall, winter and spring are the timelines for the NWEA/MAP assessment. We have currently taken the fall assessment and 48% of our fifth grade students are proficient.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lara Silva (silva_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Provide professional development on how to use the Achievement Level Descriptors in lesson planning. Provide professional development on how to implement the "Common Science Assessments" developed by the district and school task force. Increase opportunities to work on grade level assignments that increase grade level mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By teaching rigorous lessons, developing quality lesson plans and increasing hands on science opportunities, students will score higher on state science assessments.

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.

Research computer based programs focused on science instruction of standards

Person Responsible: Lara Silva (silva_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 30, 2023

Organize site-based field trips at Chocachatti by MOSI, the local science museum.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Griffith (griffith_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 31, 2023

Deliver professional development on ALD and Common Assessments to fifth grade teachers.

Person Responsible: Lara Silva (silva_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 31, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).