Pasco County Schools

Double Branch Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 16

Budget to Support Goals 16

Double Branch Elementary School

31500 CHANCEY RD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33543

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

Demographics

Principal: Lori Wiggins

Start Date for this Principal: 1/23/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (61%) 2014-15: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 16

Budget to Support Goals 16

Double Branch Elementary School

31500 CHANCEY RD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33543

https://dbes.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	No	31%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

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.

We exist to provide a world class education to all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All our students achieving success in college, in career, and in life!

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
Wiggins, Lori	Principal	To provide the leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to student learning at the highest possible level appropriate to age group, and to assume responsibility for all aspects of the school's operation.
Tidd, Charlene	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District.

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	111	102	107	131	122	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	695
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	6	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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)

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	69%	58%	57%	65%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	58%	59%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	54%	53%	50%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	60%	63%	64%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	61%	62%	67%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	50%	51%	55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	53%	53%	56%	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	111 (0)	102 (0)	107 (0)	131 (0)	122 (0)	122 (0)	695 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	3 ()	6 ()	6 ()	0 ()	6 ()	23 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	1 ()	4 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	3 ()	2 ()	1 ()	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	16 ()	14 ()	17 ()	47 (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	68%	60%	8%	58%	10%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	59%	11%	58%	12%
	2018	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	64%	55%	9%	56%	8%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	59%	0%	62%	-3%
	2018	64%	59%	5%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	62%	6%	64%	4%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	58%	57%	1%	60%	-2%
	2018	71%	58%	13%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	53%	4%	53%	4%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	20	32	24	23	53	56	24				
ELL	48	56		43	47	50					
ASN	60			73							
BLK	56	63	62	50	63	36	27				
HSP	71	63	33	68	67	64	72				
MUL	71	45		75	73						
WHT	71	62	52	66	60	53	58				
FRL	55	57	45	50	58	52	49				

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	25	36	36	33	48	32	25				
ELL	33	44	60	41	50	36					
ASN	67			77							
BLK	50	43	25	48	56	41	58				
HSP	63	59	55	68	68	37	49				
MUL	74	50		79	79						

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	70	58	52	67	65	38	83				
FRL	51	45	32	49	58	41	50				

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	17	46	46	17	37	42	14				
ELL	35	60		45	60	70	31				
ASN	50			71							
BLK	51	58	50	53	60	53	38				
HSP	63	59	50	58	63	52	63				
MUL	78	60		78	80						
WHT	69	61	52	68	70	59	59				
FRL	57	60	44	50	63	54	44				

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
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	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	60
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	51
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 is in English Language Arts for Students with Disabilities which is at 22%. The achievement level for SWD decreased 3%. The learning gains dropped 4%. The Students with Disabilities in the lowest 25% decreased significantly 12%. Some of the contributing factors may be the in the need for consensus around Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports for Students with Disabilities.

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

The greatest decline was in the area of science for black students which went from 58% to 27%. There was an emphasis on the mathematics and English Language Arts which entailed significant growth for black students.

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.

Our lowest gap in comparison to the state was in the are English Language Arts lowest 25% when compared to the state. The gap was 2% lower than the state. This would due to the low performance of our lowest 25%/ Students with Disabilities significantly decreased from 36% to 24%. The contributing factors need the examination of our T2 and T3 supports for Students with Disabilities.

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

Our most significant improvement was in the area of Mathematics Learning Gain for our lowest 25%. The increase for this area went from 39% to 53%. This significant increase was also reflected with Students with Disabilities which increased from 32% to 56%. The improvements are a reflection of the second year of implementing Eureka Mathematics with increased fidelity.

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

The two areas of of concerns is the achievement level of students meeting grade level standards in the area of English Language Arts specifically for students identified in the lowest 25% and in the area of science.

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

1. Engaged instructional personnel in data driven decision making to analyze the need of all students within the lowest 25% for English Language Arts.
2. Align interventions with the needs notated from formative assessments. Consistently review the impact of aligned interventions.
3. Deepen the understanding of the Quality Analysis Planning with a focus on differentiating needs while maintaining grade level rigor.
4. Engage personnel in peer reflection during walkthrough for Core Actions 2 & Core Actions 3 of the

Instructional Practice Guide. In addition, for increase student engagement in science.
5. Increase the completion of reading endorsements among the faculty.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Data Driven Decision Making (ELA)
Rationale	There is a need to ensure students in the lowest 35% and specifically students with disabilities are making learning gains as well as increasing proficiency with the English Language Arts Standards. The level of proficiency for students with disabilities are currently at 22%. Only 32% of students with disabilities have learning gains. More importantly the learning gains of the lowest 25% are at 24% of students with disabilities.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019 - 2020 school year, students with disabilities achievement level will increase to 55%. The learning gains for both the overall learning gain and the learning gain of the lowest 25% will increase to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lori Wiggins (lwiggins@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use data from IRLA, formative assessments and end-of-unit assessments to identify students for Tier 2 support by student, standard/learning and learning target. Design and evaluate Tier planning through Quality Assessment Planning and determine Tier 2 interventions for academic essential learning Utilize Rancher time for Tier 3 interventions with the connections to Core Instruction Identify students needing intensive support. Prioritize resources based upon students' greatest needs. Diagnose, treat, prioritize, and monitor Tier 3 intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By developing a cohesive system to analyze data to monitor growth, and teams/PLCs engage in problem-solving processes to monitor effectiveness of core instruction and intervention supports, students will receive intentional and strategic interventions to close the gap and master standards.
Action Step	
Description	1. Differentiating and Monitoring the learning to close gaps and provide enrichment (Data Reviews) 2. Analyzing and Strengthening our Multiple Systems of Support for Academics and Behavior 3. Monitor for the implementation of core actions 2 & 3 per the instructional practice guide to ensure there is rigorous instruction and student engaged at high levels of learning. 4. Deepen the understanding of Tier 1 instruction through the work with prioritized standards with the Quality Analysis Planning while engaged in high functioning Professional Learning Communities 5. Empower our learners (both adults & students) while engaging in developing Social Emotional Learning professional development.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

We will continue our partnership with USF and the Teachers' Leader Academy while supporting our teacher's aspirations for teacher leadership. This will support the efforts for teacher recruitment and retainment.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Data Driven Decision Making (ELA)**	**$0.00**

Total:	**$0.00**