

Hernando County School District

John D. Floyd Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	10

John D. Floyd Elementary School

3139 DUMONT AVE, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/fes>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	B	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

The mission of John D. Floyd Elementary School is to promote a partnership with students, parents, and the community by providing a supportive educational environment enhanced by technology that encourages problem solving and responsible choices, thus preparing all to meet tomorrow's challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Attitude Determines Altitude...

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
White, Elissa	Teacher, K-12
Anderson, Kara	Teacher, K-12
Lewis, Joyce	Principal
Tomlinson, Melissa	Assistant Principal
Grover, Lisa	Teacher, K-12
Rode, Wendi	Teacher, K-12
Oppedal, Jan	Teacher, K-12
Jackson, Sid	School Counselor
Truman, Allyson	Teacher, K-12

Duties

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

The school based leadership team (SBLT) which consists of the Administrative Team, School Counselors, Assessment and all Team Leaders is scheduled to meet bi-weekly to discuss the status of school initiatives driven by the SIP. During this time the team has open discussions regarding student progress monitoring data, curriculum/resource concerns, walkthrough data, professional development, status of the MTSS process and students who are moving through the tiers.

Administration on a regular basis will attend grade level team meetings to discuss student data, the instructional needs of the team, and how/what resources are needed at this particular time. SIP strategies are evaluated based on effectiveness and if changes are to be made, communication is formulated and distributed. Walkthroughs are done on a daily basis and observations are discussed. Prior professional development opportunities are evaluate on their continued effectiveness and new opportunities are planned. Exemplary practices are shared with faculty and collegiality is encouraged.

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	28	22	7	10	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	12	7	22	13	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	3	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	46	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	9	7	22	20	25	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	12	3	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	4	5	3	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Date this data was collected

Saturday 8/25/2018

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	33	34	50	30	35	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	6	11	13	16	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	5	3	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	73	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198

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	18	8	16	24	44	50	52	37	57	0	0	0	0	306

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	33	34	50	30	35	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	6	11	13	16	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	5	3	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	73	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198

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	18	8	16	24	44	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

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?

Only 41% of our math bottom quartile students made gains. While this is an increase from the 16-17 school year, we are still below district average by 2% and below state average by 6%. This is a trend because math has historically been our lowest performing subject.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

3rd grade ELA showed the greatest decline by 8%.

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

Students scoring 3 or above in math grades 4 and 5. 4th grade Floyd 52% state 62%. 5th grade Floyd 43% state 61%

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

4th grade ELA showed the most improvement with a 16% gain. This is not a trend.

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

Integrating text based writing into all subject areas, utilizing iReady program with all students with fidelity, having a dedicated MTSS time where Tier II and Tier III students received remediation all led to the improvement in this area.

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	54%	55%	56%	57%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	53%	55%	49%	48%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	51%	48%	37%	40%	46%
Math Achievement	55%	62%	62%	59%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	47%	53%	59%	57%	58%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	47%	51%	43%	46%
Science Achievement	49%	58%	55%	52%	54%	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	28 (33)	22 (34)	7 (50)	10 (30)	13 (35)	28 (31)	108 (213)
One or more suspensions	12 (6)	7 (11)	22 (13)	13 (16)	19 (14)	16 (25)	89 (85)
Course failure in ELA or Math	12 (4)	3 (5)	4 (3)	13 (8)	0 (1)	0 (0)	32 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	30 (37)	46 (73)	50 (88)	126 (198)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	56%	62%	-6%	57%	-1%
	2017	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	60%	53%	7%	56%	4%
	2017	44%	55%	-11%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2018	47%	53%	-6%	55%	-8%
	2017	47%	54%	-7%	53%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	67%	67%	0%	62%	5%
	2017	67%	66%	1%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
	2017	50%	66%	-16%	64%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2018	43%	56%	-13%	61%	-18%
	2017	29%	57%	-28%	57%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	48%	56%	-8%	55%	-7%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

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
SWD	23	55	58	33	30	43					
ELL	28	44		39	44						
BLK	48	60		42	40		50				
HSP	56	62	57	56	54	48	56				
MUL	59	53		52	45		64				
WHT	54	48	50	56	46	36	44				
FRL	51	49	44	52	43	34	45				
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
SWD	21	41	42	18	14	10	23				
ELL	29	36		29	25						
BLK	59	52		53	33		50				
HSP	44	41	41	38	26	28	44				
MUL	57	27		54	31						
WHT	55	44	43	55	29	13	53				
FRL	48	40	42	48	29	23	41				

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

Title	Our focus will be increasing math learning gains for all students by 2% for students in grades 3-5.
Rationale	Based on district and state data, JD Floyd shows the greatest deficit in students making learning gains in math. JD Floyd only has 47% of our students making adequate progress, where as the state was at 59% and the district was at 53%.
Intended Outcome	JD Floyd 3-5 grade students will increase learning gains in math by 2% which will get us closer to district and state averages.
Point Person	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purchase iReady math instructional for grades K-5 with a dedicated computer lab time. 2. Provide more para support by hiring additional personnel to give each grade level K-5. 3. Share disaggregated math data with teachers and build small groups based on iReady data. (Lewis & Tomlinson). 4. Monitor iReady data to ensure students are receiving the necessary time as outlined by iReady protocol. 5. Meet monthly with math teachers to review classroom data (benchmark, formative), and iReady data. 6. Meet quarterly for data chats with a focus on bottom quartile and how they are performing in MTSS. 7. Provide paras to assist with Tier II remediation allowing teachers to pull more Tier III groups. This will be monitored through MTSS logs documenting the standards addressed.
--------------------	---

Person Responsible	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	--

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	<p>We will monitor math data through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly and quarterly data chats with teachers. 2. Weekly pulls and evaluation of iReady data usage and growth monitoring reports to ensure students are completing their minutes and their percent correct is at 80% or higher. 3. At bi-weekly PLC's, review of teacher data and MTSS binders. 4. Monitor paras MTSS documentation for fidelity of instruction. 5. Review students data during quarterly data chats, especially bottom quartile students.
Person Responsible	Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	If the staff focuses on rigorous standards based instruction, then student achievement will improve. We will increase grades 3-5 proficiency of 3 or higher by 2% in ELA and Math.
Rationale	If teachers increase rigorous standards based instruction, the gap between JD Floyd and the district and state will decrease.
Intended Outcome	Student achievement will increase by 2% in ELA and Math.
Point Person	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	District coaches will come in during team planning to assist teachers. Lesson plans will be turned in on Friday and evaluated by administration. Teachers will be required to use iReady lesson during whole and small group instruction. Walkthroughs will happen regularly to ensure lessons being taught match lesson plans and standards.
Person Responsible	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	iReady Diagnostic data will be evaluated after every test to ensure student growth.
Person Responsible	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------