Fox Hollow Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fox Hollow Elementary School

8309 FOX HOLLOW DR, Port Richey, FL 34668

https://fhes.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Pitkoff

Start Date for this Principal: 5/18/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (34%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Table of Contents

Fox Hollow Elementary School

8309 FOX HOLLOW DR, Port Richey, FL 34668

https://fhes.pasco.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	89%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

To inspire and motivate students to become college and career ready through high expectations, respect, and student-oriented work throughout the learning community!

At FHES, we are committed to:
Building and maintaining strong relationships
Inspiring all
Ensuring safety
Believing in all
Being a champion
Showing empathy towards all

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Owl" Be Your Champion!

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kinzie, Karyn	Principal	Our school leadership team is comprised of: PLC Facilitators from each team, K-5 and ESE Coaching Team School Intervention Team

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	94	73	76	87	71	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	14	18	23	16	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	7	9	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	16	3	17	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	5	12	12	18	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	13	10	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
22

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/19/2019

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	58%	57%	33%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	56%	58%	48%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	54%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	60%	63%	40%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	61%	62%	59%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	51%	55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	53%	53%	39%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	94 (0)	73 (0)	76 (0)	87 (0)	71 (0)	74 (0)	475 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (0)	18 (0)	23 (0)	16 (0)	18 (0)	12 (0)	101 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	8 (0)	30 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (0)	16 (0)	3 (0)	17 (0)	6 (0)	9 (0)	56 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	5 (0)	12 (0)	12 (0)	18 (0)	18 (0)	25 (0)	90 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	40%	57%	-17%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	59%	-14%	58%	-13%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	35%	55%	-20%	56%	-21%
	2018	37%	56%	-19%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	59%	-22%	62%	-25%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	62%	-18%	64%	-20%
	2018	43%	59%	-16%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	34%	57%	-23%	60%	-26%
	2018	37%	58%	-21%	61%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
	2018	35%	56%	-21%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	35	36	23	45	38	31				
ELL											
BLK	17	10		27							
HSP	43	43		32	54	38	32				
MUL	23			45							
WHT	48	49	71	45	53	31	55				
FRL	41	40	47	38	53	42	42				

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	12	39	41	12	32	20					
BLK	18	64		14	60						
HSP	41	55	64	31	35	20	36				
MUL	36			36							
WHT	42	57	57	52	63	40	36				
FRL	36	57	65	36	54	44	29				
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	5	41	50	17	50	40	8				
ELL	17	30		17	70						
BLK	30	50		22	36						
HSP	25	40	46	29	60	64	24				
WHT	38	49	56	47	63	46	50				
FRL	29	46	52	36	57	55	35				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	18
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component showing the lowest performance was Math Lowest Quartile (38%), as well as Math Achievement (41%). We will continue to strengthen Math routines and increase student engagement through Kagan structures. It is an area that continues to need direct focus, specifically for our scholars that are require Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction to close the gaps.

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

The data that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA Learning Gains (57% to 42%) and ELA Lowest Quartile (64% to 48%). We spent a lot of our time analyzing student data and creating groups of scholars who needed tiered supports, but our practices did not strategically focus on how to close the gaps for these scholars.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

When compared to the state average, fifth grade Math had the greatest gap with 26%. Also, third grade Math with 25%. Math is an area that needs direct focus, specifically for our scholars that are in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction to close the gaps.

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

5th grade Science data showed the most improvement. We implemented a Science Lab setting where classes visited once a month for a hands-on science lessons modeled and/or co-taught by the Coach. We also ensured time was carved out to teach Science content every day.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Two areas of concern that are reflected on the EWS data are Attendance and Course Failure in ELA or Math. We will continue to focus on increasing attendance by way of building and maintaining positive relationships with families, as well as increase student engagement practices.

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

1. Increase in ELA Learning Gains
2. Increase in ELA Lowest Quartile

3. Focus on SWD in all content
4. Focus on Black/African American and Multi-racial scholars in all content

We will do this through increased student engagement practices, a focus on tiered supports and writing across the curriculum.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	High Impact Instruction
Rationale	It is imperative that our teachers provide high impact instruction to our scholars, so they are college, career and life ready. For 2018-2019 school year, our overall Core Action data showed 51% YES. More specifically, 51% YES in Core Action 2 and 26% YES in Core Action 3.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, using the district's Core Action Walkthrough Tool, 75% of teachers will show evidence that they are planning, delivering, assessing and monitoring standards-based instruction matched to the rigor of the standards, with a focus on Core Action 2 and 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement the following: *Core Connections (Writing framework) *Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures *Focused PD on IPG's Core Actions 2 and 3
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We must continue to increase scholar engagement through high quality, standards-based instruction to ensure our scholars are given every opportunity to learn at high levels.
Action Step	
Description	1.Teachers will attend PD for Kagan, Day 3 and initial Core Connections Training 2. Teachers will implement Kagan structures and Core Connections framework 3. Administration will schedule follow-up PD and Coaching (for Kagan and Core Connections) 4. Administration will use the Core Connections and Kagan look-for tools when conducting walkthroughs 5. Additional in-house coaching will be provided after walkthroughs occur
Person Responsible	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Data Driven Decisions
Rationale	There is a need to tightly monitor scholars in our Lowest 35% due to the increase in scholars not demonstrating learning gains in Reading and Math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, PLCs will create, implement and monitor instruction in Reading and Mathematics, including Tier 2 and Tier 3, which will increase our proficiency FSA data by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	*We will meet monthly as a Student Intervention Team to monitor the data of our scholars in the Lowest 35%. We will present and problem solve all aspects of our early warning system data for each scholar. *Every other week, grade level teams will meet to create and/or monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 action plans during their Data PLC.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	It is important to ensure all stakeholders are involved in the success of our scholars, therefore, we have a variety of staff members on our Student Intervention Team.
Action Step	
Description	1. Meet monthly, as scheduled 2. Analyze student data 3. Create action plan 4. Admin team will monitor action plan, biweekly 5. Revisit action plan; change as needed
Person Responsible	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Collaborative Culture
Rationale	Our 2018-2019 Gallup Employee Engagement survey data increased from 3.88 to 4.04. We did not meet our 18-19 goal, but made great growth. We decreased in Student Hope from 37% to 28% and also decreased in Student Engagement by 1% (51%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By October 2019, the grand mean of our Gallup Employee Engagement survey will increase .06 from 4.04 to 4.10. The percentage of Student Hope will increase from 28% to 35% and Student Engagement will increase from 51% to 60% on the Gallup Student survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Staff will implement practices of Conscious Discipline, such as Safe Place, Morning Greeting, Classroom Meeting and other connecting activities. Staff will also participate in district-mandated monthly Social Emotional Learning (SEL) training on all Early Release Days for 19-20.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We MUST ensure our school is a safe and positive place for scholars to learn. Our staff need to have an understanding of the trauma our scholars experience each and every day while maintaining high expectations for their success. When scholars feel safe, they are free from judgment and insecurity.
Action Step	
Description	1. Staff will participate in Conscious Discipline (CD) training 2. Staff will create Safe Place in classroom and implement morning greetings and classroom meeting each day 3. Administration will monitor the implementation of CD 4. Staff will participate in monthly SEL training 5. We will focus on all of these things while maintaining a positive school culture for our staff (per our Gallup data).
Person Responsible	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).