**Hillsborough County Public Schools** 

# Folsom Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

### **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 4  |
|                                |    |
| Needs Assessment               | 7  |
|                                |    |
| Planning for Improvement       | 10 |
|                                |    |
| Title I Requirements           | 11 |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 14 |

### **Folsom Elementary School**

9855 HARNEY RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

[ no web address on file ]

#### **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<br>PK-5                     | Yes                    | 90%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)       | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)         |
| K-12 General Education                        | No                     | 78%   |
| School Grades History                         |                        |   |
|   |                        | ı   |

2016-17

D

2015-16

D

2014-15

D\*

#### **School Board Approval**

Year

**Grade** 

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

2017-18

D

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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.

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:

Students will demonstrate academic proficiency and responsible citizenship.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student, every day, college bound.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Nan        | ne        | Title |
|------------|-----------|-------|
| Ham, Deena | Principal |       |

#### **Duties**

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

Leadership team meetings can include the following:

Principal

Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator

Guidance Counselor

SAC Chairs

School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative

School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative

Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis)

ESE teachers

PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area

District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches)

The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:

- 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the Rtl/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
- 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
- 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
- 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.

Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.

HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.

Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development.

Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact.

Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.

#### **Early Warning Systems**

Year 2017-18

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                        | K           | 1  | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 16 | 9 | 25 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 1 | 2  | 3  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| 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 | 5  | 35 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 92    |

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

| Indicator                                  |   | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                  | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0           | 0 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

#### Date this data was collected

Thursday 8/9/2018

#### Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                        | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 7           | 27 | 16 | 18 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 94    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 2  | 5  | 6  | 3  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| 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  | 10 | 34 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |

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

| Indicator                                  |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | Le | eve | I |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                  | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9  | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |

#### **Year 2016-17 - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                        | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 7           | 27 | 16 | 18 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 94    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 2  | 5  | 6  | 3  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| 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  | 10 | 34 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |

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

| Indicator                                  |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                  | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 2           | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |

#### 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?

Our lowest scoring component occurred in reading. The bottom quartile across grade levels 3 thru 5 showed the lowest improvement in the area of reading.

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

Students declined in reading by 5 points in comparison to scores from 2017.

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

In comparison to the state average, reading scores were lower by 23 points.

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

Math scores showed the most improvement increasing by 15 points in 2018. This is an improvement in comparison to a 10 point decrease from 2016 to 2017.

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

Our increase in data points were connected to standards based planning and instruction. Professional development opportunities were offered frequently and purposefully. Professional learning communities focused on analyzing data to drive instruction. Coaching cycles were implemented to assist teachers in building capacity and mastering the content being delivered in the classroom.

#### **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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 33%    | 52%      | 56%   | 35%    | 48%      | 52%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 37%    | 52%      | 55%   | 41%    | 49%      | 52%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 32%    | 46%      | 48%   | 26%    | 44%      | 46%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Achievement            | 44%    | 55%      | 62%   | 39%    | 52%      | 58%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 55%    | 57%      | 59%   | 47%    | 53%      | 58%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 36%    | 44%      | 47%   | 41%    | 43%      | 46%   |  |  |  |  |
| Science Achievement         | 35%    | 51%      | 55%   | 38%    | 51%      | 51%   |  |  |  |  |

### **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Indicator Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |        |         |         |         |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|---|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicator                       | K   | 1       | 2      | 3       | 4       | 5       | Total   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1 (7)                                       | 16 (27) | 9 (16) | 25 (18) | 16 (16) | 13 (10) | 80 (94) |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0)                                       | 1 (2)   | 1 (5)  | 2 (6)   | 3 (3)   | 2 (5)   | 9 (21)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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)  | 5 (10)  | 35 (34) | 52 (52) | 92 (96) |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |
| 03                    | 2018      | 33%    | 53%      | -20%                              | 57%   | -24%                           |  |  |
|                       | 2017      | 38%    | 56%      | -18%                              | 58%   | -20%                           |  |  |
| Same Grade C          | omparison | -5%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison     |           |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
| 04                    | 2018      | 23%    | 55%      | -32%                              | 56%   | -33%                           |  |  |
|                       | 2017      | 30%    | 54%      | -24%                              | 56%   | -26%                           |  |  |
| Same Grade Comparison |           | -7%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
| Cohort Com            | parison   | -15%   |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
| 05                    | 2018      | 34%    | 51%      | -17%                              | 55%   | -21%                           |  |  |
|                       | 2017      | 38%    | 52%      | -14%                              | 53%   | -15%                           |  |  |
| Same Grade Comparison |           | -4%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison     |           | 4%     |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
| 03                    | 2018 | 48%    | 55%      | -7%                               | 62%   | -14%                           |  |
|                       | 2017 | 22%    | 54%      | -32%                              | 62%   | -40%                           |  |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 26%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |

| MATH                  |                       |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade                 | Year                  | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
| 04                    | 2018                  | 24%    | 57%      | -33%                              | 62%   | -38%                           |  |
|                       | 2017                  | 30%    | 56%      | -26%                              | 64%   | -34%                           |  |
| Same Grade C          | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Comparison     |                       | 2%     |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| 05                    | 2018                  | 52%    | 54%      | -2%                               | 61%   | -9%                            |  |
|                       | 2017                  | 32%    | 53%      | -21%                              | 57%   | -25%                           |  |
| Same Grade Comparison |                       | 20%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Comparison     |                       | 22%    |          | _                                 |       |                                |  |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
| 05                | 2018 | 30%    | 52%      | -22%                              | 55%   | -25%                           |  |
|                   | 2017 |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |

### Subgroup Data

|           |             | 2018      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 13          | 13        | 13                | 15           | 43         | 31                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 24          | 32        |                   | 48           | 42         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 20          | 27        | 23                | 26           | 42         | 36                 | 19          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 43          | 51        | 55                | 53           | 61         | 45                 | 44          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 40          |           |                   | 50           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 40          | 33        |                   | 58           | 70         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 31          | 33        | 30                | 41           | 54         | 36                 | 31          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2017      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         | •                         |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| SWD       | 9           | 27        | 20                | 9            | 27         |                    | 27          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 23          | 39        | 38                | 18           | 48         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 31          | 37        | 35                | 19           | 34         | 27                 | 27          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 38          | 40        | 46                | 30           | 52         | 70                 | 20          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 23          |           |                   | 38           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 55          | 62        |                   | 42           | 69         |                    | 71          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 37          | 43        | 35                | 27           | 46         | 45                 | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |

### 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                 | Reading  |
| Rationale             | Our reading scores decreased by 23 points and students in the lowest quartile made the least progress based on FSA scores.   |
| Intended<br>Outcome   | Our goal is to reach 54% proficiency in reading for the school year 2019. Students in the low 25% quartile will be targeted using data-driven professional learning communities differentiating instruction to fit the needs of all students. We will focus on reading across content areas.   |
| Point<br>Person       | Deena Ham (deena.ham@sdhc.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step           |  |
| Description           | Grade level standards based common assessments will be used to guide instruction. We will be participating in weekly grade level PLC's with instructional coaches and administrators at the school site. This data will be used to drive instruction. Teachers will use Literacy Leveled Intervention to provides daily, intensive, small-group instruction. This will expose struggling to engaging leveled books and fast-paced, systematically designed lessons.  Computer based interventions and interactive lessons will be utilized to differentiate instruction. |
| Person<br>Responsible | Deena Ham (deena.ham@sdhc.k12.fl.us)   |

#### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

| We will be participating in weekly grade level PLC's with instructional coaches and |
|---|
| administrators at the school site.  |
| We will meet quarterly with each teacher to discuss students progression outcomes,  |
| interventions and/ or enrichment and next steps to monitor students' growth.        |
|   |

## Person Responsible Joanna Williams (joanna.williams@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Activity #2** 

**Title** 

Rationale

**Intended Outcome** 

Point Person [no one identified]

**Action Step** 

Description

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

Person Responsible [no one identified]

### 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.

Folsom Elementary School, staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success.

Folsom promotes positive school engagement through its positioning of guidance counseling and mentoring by members of the school community with advanced knowledge of how to support students' academic performance and emotional well-being. This effort is designed to increase school connectivity or a sense of belonging among our students. Student and parent surveys are disseminated for further needs assessment.

#### **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 and systematic allocation and use of resources, the school's PSLT/ILT utilizes an Rtl/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)

Analyze student outcomes and make data-driven decisions: What is the problem?
Why is it occurring?
What are we going to do about it?
Is it working?

Assess the implementation of the SIP:
Does the data show positive student growth?
Are we making progress toward the SIPs intended outcomes?
What can we do to sustain what's working?
What barriers to implementation are we facing?
What should be our plan of action?

Annually, schools take inventory of resource materials, staff, and funds allocated to determine necessary resource materials and personnel available to meet the needs of students. Resource maps identify gaps, ensuring resources are available and allocated for use by all.

To ensure teacher support systems, small group, individual needs are met, the PSLT: Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs across the school and all grade levels; Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks; Review progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains; Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate 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 are opportunities to review assessment 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 liaisons, others as needed

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

Teachers and administrators are continually involved in local events and often invited to participate in their community's celebrations. Administrators and teachers reach out to local businesses for participation in the school's business partners programs. As applicable, faith-based leaders are invited to form relationships with local schools.

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; Fieldtrip opportunities for career awareness; Fieldtrip 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 |              |  |  |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|
| Total:         | \$226,076.25 |  |  |