



---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>15</b> |

## 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)

Elementary School  
PK-5

**2018-19 Title I School**

Yes

**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**  
(As Reported on Survey 3)

97%

**Primary Service Type**  
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

**Charter School**

No

**2018-19 Minority Rate**  
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

90%

### School Grades History

| Year Grade | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|            | C       | D       | 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. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. 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

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name              | Title     |
|-------------------|-----------|
| Johnson, Woodland | Principal |

#### Duties

#### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

Our MTSS team is called the Problem-Solving Team and serve as the main leadership team of the school. The Problem Solving Team will meet once a month to:

Use the problem solving model to:

- . Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3)
- . Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources
- . Review and interpret student data (Academic and Behavior)
- . Organize and support systematic data collection.
- . Through the implementation of PLCs
- . Through the use of school-based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini-lessons, and Mini-assessments
- . Through the use of Common Assessments given every 2-4 weeks.
- . Through the implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions.
- . This year our Rtl team will focus on Differentiated Instruction Practices.

- . Plan, implement, and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
- . Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
- . Work collaboratively with the PLCs implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring
  - Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team
  - Assist in the implementation and monitoring of the Differentiated Accountability Model
  - Identify professional development needs and resources

The School Advisory Council (SAC) Chair is a member of the Problem Solving team. The Problem Solving Team along with the faculty and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted prior to school being out for the 17-18 school year and during preplanning for 18-19.

The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the Problem Solving Team. The large part of the work of the Problem Solving Team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Tool, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.

Since one of the main tasks of the Problem Solving Team is to monitor student data, it will monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps and suggest modifications if needed. We also will be implementing department chairs to provide teacher leadership opportunities as well as opportunities for peer collaboration.

We also have a Teacher Leader.

HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Field trip opportunities for career awareness; Field trip opportunities to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

#### 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  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 37 | 27 | 25 | 19 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 119 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 4  | 1  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 18 | 56 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 126 |

#### The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |

**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     | 2           | 0 | 2 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Date this data was collected**

Friday 7/13/2018

**Year 2016-17 - As Reported**

**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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 10          | 31 | 29 | 32 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 139   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 2  | 0  | 5  | 2  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 22 | 37 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 120   |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |

**Year 2016-17 - Updated**

**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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 10          | 31 | 29 | 32 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 139   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 2  | 0  | 5  | 2  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 22 | 37 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 120   |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 30 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**Assessment & Analysis**  
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

According to the 2018 school data, ELA achievement had performed the lowest at 36% as compared to the State data. This a trend compared to the 2017 school data in ELA achievement.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

ELA learning gains showed the greatest decline from prior year by declining 4 percentage points. The 2017 school data in ELA Learning gains was 53 %, while the 2018 school data showed 49 %.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

ELA achievement has the biggest gap when compared to the state average for year 2017-2018 because the state average was 56% and the school was 36% making it a 20% gap.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

Math gains showed the most improvement by going up from 38% to 61%.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area**

- Math ELP for 3, 4, 5
- Math tutoring during the day
- Saturday ELP
- Small group instruction based on skill

**School Data**  
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     | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                            | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement            | 36%    | 52%      | 56%   | 34%    | 52%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains         | 49%    | 52%      | 55%   | 53%    | 55%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 60%    | 46%      | 48%   | 47%    | 51%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement           | 46%    | 55%      | 62%   | 28%    | 53%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains        | 61%    | 57%      | 59%   | 38%    | 54%      | 61%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52%    | 44%      | 47%   | 45%    | 46%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 45%    | 51%      | 55%   | 31%    | 48%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |           |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1 (10)                            | 37 (31) | 27 (29) | 25 (32) | 19 (18) | 10 (19) | 119 (139) |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0)                             | 0 (2)   | 4 (0)   | 1 (5)   | 2 (2)   | 0 (2)   | 7 (11)    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 18 (22) | 56 (37) | 52 (61) | 126 (120) |

### Grade Level Data

**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 |
| 03                    | 2018 | 35%    | 53%      | -18%                       | 57%   | -22%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 29%    | 56%      | -27%                       | 58%   | -29%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 37%    | 55%      | -18%                       | 56%   | -19%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 44%    | 54%      | -10%                       | 56%   | -12%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 27%    | 51%      | -24%                       | 55%   | -28%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 23%    | 52%      | -29%                       | 53%   | -30%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -17%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 42%    | 55%      | -13%                       | 62%   | -20%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 25%    | 54%      | -29%                       | 62%   | -37%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 17%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 46%    | 57%      | -11%                       | 62%   | -16%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 30%    | 56%      | -26%                       | 64%   | -34%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 21%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 34%    | 54%      | -20%                       | 61%   | -27%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 19%    | 53%      | -34%                       | 57%   | -38%                    |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 2018 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| WHT                                       | 31       | 47     |             | 54        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 48     | 62          | 35        | 50      | 50           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 40       | 50     | 57          | 50        | 65      | 53           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| SWD                                       | 14       | 48     | 55          | 25        | 63      | 52           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 36       | 49     | 61          | 46        | 61      | 53           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 31       | 53     | 56          | 42        | 63      | 52           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2017 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| WHT                                       | 38       | 72     |             | 32        | 44      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 60     |             | 17        | 30      |              | 22       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 35       | 48     | 34          | 32        | 39      | 54           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| SWD                                       | 12       | 38     | 33          | 15        | 33      | 45           | 6        |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 33       | 54     | 49          | 28        | 38      | 46           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 31       | 47     | 35          | 32        | 38      | 47           | 24       |         |           |                   |                     |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

#### Areas of Focus:

**Activity #1**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>            | Assessment   |
| <b>Rationale</b>        | Student achievement will increase when there is assessments during and at the end of the lessons measuring the mastery of the standards.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b> | Smart Goal<br>Student proficiency will increase by 14 percentage points in ELA. ELA learning gains will increase by 11 percentage points. We will maintain 60% achievement for the lowest 25% for ELA. |
| <b>Point Person</b>     | Woodland Johnson (woodland.johnson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)   |

**Action Step**

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Description</b>        | Teacher<br>1. Teacher groups students in a way that allows them to monitor student progress efficiently and aggressively both individually and in whole group (i.e. Bambrick Rigor Trajectory 5 & 7).<br>2. Teacher exemplar/model is clear, explicit and visible in the classroom. (i.e Bambrick Rigor Trajectory 8).<br>3. Teacher formally assesses students at the end of the lesson utilizing lesson closure strategies (i.e. 40 Ways to Leave a Lesson).<br>4. Assessment is evident though backwards planning, using questions and stopping points to measure achievement of standards.<br><br>Student<br>1. Students are able to articulate criteria for success.<br>2. Students are engaged in self-monitoring throughout the lesson by referring to the teacher model and visible guides. Students will self-advocate and ask for clarification if there is misunderstanding of the content or task.<br>3. Students are able to defend their thinking and reasoning, utilizing evidence from the text or strategy highlighted in the standard being taught (verbally or written). |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Woodland Johnson (woodland.johnson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)  |

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Description</b>        | Data from Walk-throughs, Informal/ Formal Evaluations Results, coaching cycles, staff developments. |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Woodland Johnson (woodland.johnson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)  |

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Activity #2</b>                   |   |
| <b>Title</b>                         | Differentiation   |
| <b>Rationale</b>                     | Student achievement will increase when all students are engaged in rigorous differentiated lessons that are well-planned, aligned with content and standards, and incorporate assessment throughout and at the end the lesson.  |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>              | Student proficiency will increase by 14 percentage points in ELA. ELA learning gains will increase by 11 percentage points. We will maintain 60% achievement for the lowest 25% for ELA.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>                  | Woodland Johnson (woodland.johnson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Action Step</b>                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>                   | <p>Teacher</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher is able to articulate standard and refer back to it throughout the lesson.</li> <li>2. Standard are posted clearly and visible in classroom.</li> <li>3. Lesson plans reflect language of the standard and is visible for review as needed.</li> <li>4. Lesson plans reflect planning for misconceptions.</li> <li>5. Teacher is able to identify and plan for levels of differentiation of all students (i.e. materials, questions, anticipated responses, exit tickets, individual plans for groups).</li> </ol> <p>Student</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students know and can verbalize lesson objective.</li> <li>2. Students can articulate why the standard is important to practice and master.</li> <li>3. Student are engaged in task that are aligned with the objective.</li> <li>4. During the lesson, students are paired, grouped, or working individually to ensure mastery towards the standard.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Woodland Johnson (woodland.johnson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Plan to Monitor Effectiveness</b> |   |
| <b>Description</b>                   | Staff Development Content Trainings: ELA, Math, Science Coaching Cycles<br>Technology Trainings   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Woodland Johnson (woodland.johnson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)  |

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

Parent Involvement Plan Uploaded For Title One

**PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Program

Students are engaged in SEL programs based on their needs and within the HCPS "Building Strong School Culture" framework. This framework includes: Mission and Vision; Procedures & Routines; Promoting & Modeling Great Character; Service Learning; Student Leadership; Conflict Resolution; Mentoring; and Behavior Management Plan. In this way, SEL becomes a part of the fabric of a school's culture.

Hillsborough County Public Schools has partnered with Frameworks of Tampa Bay to integrate SEL into all middle schools. Students will be engaged with LifeSkills training, an evidence-based program that is designed to improve social, emotional, and academic skills and strengthen relationships between students and teachers.

Behavior Management Plan

Included in the HCPS "Building Strong School Culture" framework is the need for a behavior management plan. A comprehensive behavior management plan is an important part of the social/emotional framework. It is expected that all settings will be structured for success, expectations for student behavior will be explicitly taught, students will be consistently supervised, teachers will build positive relationships with students, and that students will be corrected fluently, calmly, consistently, respectfully, briefly, and immediately.

Comprehensive behaviors plans should address a behavior support team, faculty/ stakeholder commitment, school-wide expectations with a plan for teaching those expectations, effective processes for tracking and documenting behavior incidents and interventions, plan progress monitoring, location-based rules, effective reward/recognition program that includes restorative practices, and a focus on data-based decision making.

It is an expectation that behavior management plans for all DA and Achievement Schools include the 10 Critical Elements for Effective School Wide Management Plans, Restorative Practices, the use of Behavior Tracker to track minor incidences (in classroom), and a separate tool to track ALL interventions (admin/ student services). There may additionally be a need for a Behavior Intervention Team (may choose to use PSLT).

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

The School Board of each Florida district is required by state law to establish a comprehensive program for student progression that is based on an evaluation of each student's performance including an assessment of how well the student masters the

performance standards approved by the state board. The district's program for student progression is based on mastery of the English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies standards. (F.S. 1008.25)

The HCPS Student Progression Plan includes information on initial placement, reporting student progress, reading remediation, academic acceleration, grade promotion and retention, graduation requirements, transfer credits, student recognition, accommodations, dual enrollment, and extended learning opportunities.

For complete information, please visit our Student Progression Plan at:  
<http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/docs/00/00/21/33/studentprogressionplan.pdf>

HCPS utilizes a variety of strategies for assisting students as they transition from one school to another.

HCPS employs multiple strategies for preparing children for entry into kindergarten. Over 6,000 children participate in one of several preschool programs offered by the School District (Head Start, VPK and PreK-ESE). Developmental screenings are available for all families prior to entry into kindergarten through Child Find, a service within the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). Additionally, the district works closely with School Readiness providers to share information.

HCPS utilizes multiple strategies for preparing students for their next school, including transitioning from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, or simply moving to a new school mid-year. Examples include:

- Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
- Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
- Parent information and/or education opportunities
- Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
- Campus visits
- Shadow days
- Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
- High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

To ensure efficient/systematic allocation and use of resources, the PSLT/ILT utilizes an RtI/MTSS framework to improve learning for all. Resources allocated support a continuum of academic and behavioral supports, ensuring all students have fluid access to instruction (varying intensity levels matched to most appropriate available resources).

An annual inventory of resource materials, staff, and funds allocated determines necessary resource materials and personnel available to meet student needs through a resource map.

To ensure support systems, small group, and individual needs are met, the PSLT:  
Reviews school-wide data on an ongoing basis, identifying instructional needs across the

school; Supports the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks; Reviews progress monitoring data of core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains; Communicates school-wide data to PLCs, facilitating problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The PSLT meets regularly (bi-weekly/monthly). The PSLT meeting calendar is structured around the district's assessment calendar, ensuring opportunities to review assessments, outcome data, and engage in the problem solving process for appropriate data-driven decisions. Team members include administrator(s), guidance counselor(s), school psychologist, ESE specialist, content area coaches/specialists, PLC teacher liaisons, others as needed

#### Title I:

##### PartA

Funding enriches eligible schools with additional instructional staff, PD, ELP, and supplemental resources for raising student achievement in high-poverty schools.

##### PartC- Migrant

The migrant advocate provides services and support to students, parents, teachers and other programs to ensure that students' needs are met. Supplementary services include identification and recruitment, advocacy, health/social services, academic support, parental involvement and family literacy.

##### PartD

Funds support the Alternative Education Program, providing transition services from alternative education to school of choice, and includes mentoring, intervention services and educational support using transition specialists, teachers, paras and tutors.

#### TitleII

Funds for PD to provide/promote high quality professional learning that supports improved job performance for all resulting in increased student achievement. PD includes alternative certification, instructional support training and teacher induction program.

#### TitleIII

Services are provided to ensure ELLs have access to academic content that is equal in scope, sequence, breadth, and depth to the curricular offerings available to all. Services include educational materials and ELL district supported services such as interpreters, translators, bi-lingual support services, teachers, parent involvement and community outreach programs, improving education of immigrant and ELLs.

#### TitleX- Homeless

Coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunities. Federal funds are "braided" to support supplemental academic resource teachers at district school sites and to support selected professional learning opportunities for teachers.

#### TitleIV

Funds used provide academic enrichment activities for high-needs students including college and career counseling, STEM, arts, civics, IB/AP. Funds also support safe and healthy students through mental health services, drug and violence prevention and PE. Effective use of classroom technology is supported through PD.

HeadStart

Appropriate assessments identify a child's strengths, interests, needs and learning styles. Schools utilize information from students to transition into kindergarten.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Field trip opportunities for career awareness; Field trip opportunities to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.

**Part V: Budget**

|               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |
|---------------|---------------|