**Hillsborough County Public Schools** 

# Thonotosassa Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| Darman and Oration of the OID  | •  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3  |
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 4  |
|                                |    |
| Needs Assessment               | 7  |
|                                |    |
| Planning for Improvement       | 9  |
|                                |    |
| Title I Requirements           | 10 |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 13 |

# **Thonotosassa Elementary School**

10050 SKEWLEE RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

[ no web address on file ]

## **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID I |          | 2017-18 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | B Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>rted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|---|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5              | School   | Yes                   |            | 91%   |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I     | • •      | Charter School        | (Reporte   | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)           |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation | No                    |            | 64%   |
| School Grades Histo               | ory      |                       |            |   |
| Year                              | 2017-18  | 2016-17               | 2015-16    | 2014-15   |

D

C

D\*

## **School Board Approval**

**Grade** 

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

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.

Thonotosassa Elementary promotes student achievement by engaging and empowering students in a supportive and caring environment. Through quality standards-based lesson planning, we challenge students to become problem solvers and future community leaders. The percent of our students making gains on standardized testing will increase annually through our focus on differentiated instruction, rigor, and progress monitoring.

#### 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:

We will all achieve success through hard work and good character. Working together, Thonotosassa will be a top performing school.

# School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

|              | Name |           | Title |
|--------------|------|-----------|-------|
| Varnum, Lisa |      | 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 RtI/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     | 0 | 23          | 11 | 21 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83    |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 | 2           | 5  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |  |
| 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  | 16 | 24 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |  |

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

| Indicator                                  |   |   |   |   |   | Gra | de | Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                  | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5   | 6  | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 11  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |

## 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

Monday 8/13/2018

# 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     | 6           | 12 | 11 | 14 | 7  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| 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  | 16 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |

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

| Indicator                                  |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | Le | eve | ı |    |    |    | 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 | 2 | 4 | 6  | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |

## **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     | 6           | 12 | 11 | 14 | 7  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| 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  | 16 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |

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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6  | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |

# 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?

Not evident in the academic data is our attendance rate. That will be a focus for us. Our lowest performing academic FSA cell is Math Lower Quartile.

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

ELA achievement dropped 4% to 36%.

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

Our biggest gap, when compared to the state, is Mathematics achievement.

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

Math learning gains were up by 18% points, but this is off-set by our lower quartile growth.

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

We focused on math, and on targeting students for additional support.

#### **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            | 36%    | 52%      | 56%   | 38%    | 48%      | 52%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains         | 42%    | 52%      | 55%   | 50%    | 49%      | 52%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 42%    | 46%      | 48%   | 50%    | 44%      | 46%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Achievement           | 34%    | 55%      | 62%   | 36%    | 52%      | 58%   |  |  |  |  |

| School Grade Component      |        | 2018     |       |        | 2017     |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Learning Gains         | 50%    | 57%      | 59%   | 51%    | 53%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 32%    | 44%      | 47%   | 59%    | 43%      | 46%   |
| Science Achievement         | 39%    | 51%      | 55%   | 56%    | 51%      | 51%   |

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

| Indicator                       |       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         |  |  |
|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
|                                 |       | 1                                 | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       | Total   |  |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 (6) | 23 (12)                           | 11 (11) | 21 (14) | 10 (7)  | 18 (9)  | 83 (59) |  |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0) | 2 (1)                             | 5 (0)   | 2 (2)   | 3 (0)   | 4 (2)   | 16 (5)  |  |  |
| 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)   | 16 (5)  | 24 (16) | 26 (20) | 66 (41) |  |  |

# **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                  | 28%    | 53%      | -25%                              | 57%   | -29%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 44%    | 56%      | -12%                              | 58%   | -14%                           |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison               |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04           | 2018                  | 39%    | 55%      | -16%                              | 56%   | -17%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 38%    | 54%      | -16%                              | 56%   | -18%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison             | 1%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison               | -5%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05           | 2018                  | 39%    | 51%      | -12%                              | 55%   | -16%                           |
|              | 2017                  | 23%    | 52%      | -29%                              | 53%   | -30%                           |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | Cohort Comparison     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

| MATH              |                       |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade             | Year                  | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03                | 2018                  | 35%    | 55%      | -20%                              | 62%   | -27%                           |
|                   | 2017                  | 35%    | 54%      | -19%                              | 62%   | -27%                           |
| Same Grade C      | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com        | Cohort Comparison     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04                | 2018                  | 40%    | 57%      | -17%                              | 62%   | -22%                           |
|                   | 2017                  | 21%    | 56%      | -35%                              | 64%   | -43%                           |
| Same Grade C      | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |                       | 5%     |          |                                   |       |                                |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
| 05                    | 2018 | 25%    | 54%      | -29%                              | 61%   | -36%                           |  |
|                       | 2017 | 30%    | 53%      | -23%                              | 57%   | -27%                           |  |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                                   |       |                                |  |

|                   | SCIENCE |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |
|-------------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Grade             | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |
| 05                | 2018    | 37%    | 52%      | -15%                              | 55%   | -18%                           |  |  |  |
|                   | 2017    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |         |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |

# **Subgroup Data**

|           | 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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       | 9   | 27        |                   | 14           | 45         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 8   | 33        |                   | 17           | 23         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 28  | 32        | 40                | 24           | 52         |                    | 28          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 25  | 38        |                   | 29           | 26         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 75  |           |                   | 42           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 43  | 46        |                   | 43           | 55         |                    | 58          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 34  | 42        | 38                | 34           | 47         | 32                 | 38          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |   | 2017      | SCHO              | OL 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       | 17  | 50        |                   | 26           | 39         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 21  | 35        |                   | 21           | 29         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 35  | 40        |                   | 25           | 25         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 28  | 29        |                   | 23           | 25         |                    | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 47  | 50        |                   | 38           | 41         |                    | 54          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 38  | 40        | 40                | 25           | 29         | 33                 | 32          |            |              |                         |                           |

# 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                         | Increase understanding and implementation of standards based lesson planning through on site professional development, coaching and collaborative planning.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale                     | Based on review of teacher input, observation data, and student achievement scores the area of focus was developed. As teachers receive training and support to create targeted lesson plans based on the Florida Standards coupled with on site coaching, teachers will be better equipped to ensure growth with all students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intended<br>Outcome           | Math and ELA proficiency scores will increase to 41% based on the 2019 FSA Assessment data. Science proficiency scores will increase from 39% to 45% based on the 2019 State Science Assessment.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Point<br>Person               | Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action Step                   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description                   | Teacher planning supported by content area coaches Focus on progress monitoring with data chats Utilize school day tutors targeted to students based on need Allow for additional teacher planning time Record data chat summaries and PLC notes electronically Pilot LEGOs WeDo with 5th Grade                                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person<br>Responsible         | Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description                   | Progress monitor student achievement data electronically, including iReady and district formative data  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person<br>Responsible         | Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)  |  |  |  |  |  |

# 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.

We work to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. School staff, students, parents, and the community work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. Our goal is to build positive relationships with families. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by holding an open house, sending home newsletters and flyers, making parent link calls, and posting everything on our website and social media. We wish to provide information to our parents on concepts that their children are learning in school, and how to access resources to support that learning. We utilized a survey with our SAC/PTA members in order to meet their needs. We hold an annual community outreach event - this year we offered non-perishable food (through a partnership with another elementary school and a high school honor society) clothing (with support of Carousel Kids consignment

shop in Lithia, and household items (with the support of our staff, SAC, and PTA).

We aim to develop meaningful community partnerships to engage with our school and our families. We would like to further engage the county park adjacent to our property, Thonotosassa Park.Our goal is to help our families feel less isolated. We have recently begun a relationship with Feed Across America.

#### **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.

We utilize MAC (CHAMPS) and PBIS, as well as a system of positive referrals. We have implemented a "Beat the Bell" morning show pencil giveaway to encourage school attendance and on-time arrival. Our guidance counselor monitors and checks on our students with attendance issues. We are focusing on building teamwork through our LEGOs WeDo pilot program in 5th grade.

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.

This summer we brought our faculty together for a learning opportunity with Dr. Godfrey. We also worked on ensuring that all of our teachers were well versed on the "Chief Way" for student behavior and expectations. We are implementing optional school uniforms as well.

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 support systems, small group, and individual needs are met, the PSLT: Reviews school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs across the school and all grade levels; Supports the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks; Reviews progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains; Communicates 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 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.

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: | \$208,026.25   |