

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Desoto Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Desoto Elementary School

2618 CORRINE ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Emily T IR Elli

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Hillsborough 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Desoto Elementary School

2618 CORRINE ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	D	D	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

DeSoto Elementary is committed to the differentiated instruction of every student providing them with the knowledge, skills, desire, and confidence necessary to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

DeSoto Elementary will be an A school without achievement gaps.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tirelli, Emily	Principal	Leadership team includes assistant principal, content coaches and team leaders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Emily T IR Elli

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	37	33	35	32	42	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
Attendance below 90 percent	6	7	4	5	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
	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	

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	3	15	8	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	27	37	31	48	37	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	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	11	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	4	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	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	
Number of students enrolled	27	37	31	48	37	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	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	11	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	4	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	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	27%	52%	57%	45%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	55%	58%	51%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	50%	53%	33%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	42%	54%	63%	31%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	57%	62%	58%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%	46%	51%	64%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	50%	53%	42%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	18%	52%	-34%	58%	-40%
	2018	33%	53%	-20%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	26%	55%	-29%	58%	-32%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	27%	54%	-27%	62%	-35%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	57%	1%	64%	-6%
	2018	31%	57%	-26%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	61%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	51%	-13%	53%	-15%
	2018	36%	52%	-16%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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		19		14	31	17					
ELL	18	32	18	37	52		27				
BLK	31	47		31	42		31				
HSP	24	37	18	40	54	20	38				
WHT	38			77							
FRL	27	45	31	41	47	13	37				
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	14	75	73	17	24						
ELL	29	59		34	38						
BLK	26	56		24	35						
HSP	43	70	70	47	51		50				
WHT	50			50							
FRL	41	67	71	43	46	25	42				
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	4	22		8	41						
ELL	33	52		28	52		21				
BLK	41	27		31	57						
HSP	43	56		28	58		39				
FRL	44	50	33	31	59	64	42				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

ELA proficiency was our lowest performance component. Lack of foundation skills and teacher knowledge of instructional practices aligned to the standards may have been contributing factors.

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

The greatest decline occurred in the ELA learning gains of the bottom quartile.

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.

Learning gains for the bottom quartile students in math were 19% for DeSoto and 51% for the state.

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

Math learning gains increased from 45% to 49%. This was due to small group instruction provided by the classroom teachers and math coach.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The number of students retained in grades K-3 is an area for improvement.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Bottom Quartile Learning Gains in Math
3. Bottom Quartile Learning Gains in ELA
4. Science Proficiency
5. Math Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Student achievement will increase through improving overall core instruction focused on standards aligned tasks through small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

At least 50% of students will be proficient in reading as evidenced by scoring in the on-level or above-level ranges on the Spring iReady Diagnostic assessment.
At least 75% of students will be proficient in math as evidenced by scoring in the on-level or above-level ranges on the Spring iReady Diagnostic assessment.
At least 75% of students will score at or above 70% on quarterly Science common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Weekly Common Planning and follow-up sessions
2. Ongoing coaching and feedback
3. Ongoing professional development for teachers and staff based on classroom visits and progress monitoring data

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Weekly common planning sessions will allow the teachers to work directly with the content coaches to plan standards-aligned lessons based on current student needs. This time will also allow for analysis of student needs and a deeper understanding of best practices in instruction.
2. Ongoing coaching and feedback will be provided by administrators and coaches through daily classroom visits, instructional learning walks, and coaching cycles.
3. Job-embedded professional development will occur in a variety of methods including lesson studies, coaching cycles, learning walks, modeled lessons, co-planning, monthly PLC's, curriculum training, and trainings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure the master schedule provides weekly common planning time for each grade level to plan with the content area coach.
2. Develop a planning protocol to be used during common planning sessions to specifically address identification of the standard, aligned tasks, and scaffolded questions to support student understanding.
3. Administrators will provide feedback weekly to the content coaches after planning sessions in order to improve outcomes of common planning.
4. Ongoing progress monitoring will occur through monthly math assessments and monthly reading assessments in addition to district recommended formative assessments. Data analysis sessions will be used to create and adjust instructional plans.

Person Responsible

Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

1. Develop specific look-fors/observables with the leadership team and faculty focused on standards-aligned tasks through the use of small group instruction.
2. Provide weekly feedback to teachers regarding the implementation of instructional practices identified in the look-fors.

3. The Instructional Leadership Team will analyze teacher data to identify trends in order to plan professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

1. Create a monthly professional development calendar to outline needed PD and a timeline to implement with the leadership team.
2. Revisit quarterly to evaluate the effectiveness of PD methods and outcomes.
3. Meet with Instructional Leadership Team monthly to review data to drive professional development initiatives.

Person Responsible Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achievement of students with disabilities, Hispanic students, Black students, Economically Disadvantaged, and ELL students will improve through consistent, ongoing analysis of data to drive instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>The learning gains in ELA of students with disabilities will increase from 19% (2019) to 75% as evidenced by the 2021 FSA.</p> <p>The learning gains in ELA of Hispanic students will increase from 37% (2019) to 75% as evidenced by the 2021 FSA.</p> <p>The learning gains in ELA of ELL students will increase from 32% (2019) to 75% as evidenced by the 2021 FSA.</p> <p>The learning gains in ELA of Black students will increase from 47% (2019) to 75% as evidenced by the 2021 FSA.</p> <p>The learning gains in ELA of Economically Disadvantaged students will increase from 45% (2019) to 75% as evidenced by the 2021 FSA.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistent analysis of progress monitoring data to inform instruction 2. Create a comprehensive MTSS system 3. Regular data briefings with faculty and leadership team
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A consistent, ongoing system for progress monitoring and regular analysis of data will be used to ensure that instruction is targeted to students' needs. This will include monthly math and ELA formative assessments, as well as regularly planned data analysis sessions following assessments. 2. A comprehensive MTSS system will allow for early identification of students in need of specific intervention, as well as the time for the intervention to occur. 3. Faculty must be well-informed of the progress of students on a regular basis in order to maintain focus on the goals of the school.

Action Steps to Implement

Coaches will create a calendar of assessments to progress monitor understanding of standards taught. After each assessment, administrators, coaches, and teachers will meet to analyze the data and plan for upcoming instruction.

Person Responsible Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

Administration will facilitate the MTSS process with staff by creating a regular MTSS meeting schedule, identifying time in the master schedule for interventions to be provided, and provide ongoing feedback to teachers on the implementation of interventions.

Person Responsible Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

Administration will meet with the leadership team regularly to review data. Relevant data will be shared at each faculty meeting.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Ongoing data analysis, adjustments to instruction, regular coaching and feedback, and professional development will address the remaining areas of priority.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

DeSoto Elementary will engage building a positive school environment by employing various strategies that foster opportunities for school staff, student leadership, parent involvement, and business partner collaboration. Our school advisory council, Parent Teacher Association, Student Leadership Team, Professional Learning Communities, Instructional Leadership Team meetings are strategically planned venues for stakeholder voice to be heard and valued through the implementation of our clearly defined culture plan.

DeSoto Elementary will foster a positive school culture with parents and families through several events and informational sessions throughout the school year. We will have a continued focus on parental and community support of academics, as well as the social and emotional health of our students. Our goal is to increase opportunities to meaningfully engage with our parents, families, and stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$236,446.24
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$66,200.11
			Notes: Salary-The Math Resource teacher will help build teacher expertise and capacity in the area of mathematics. The math resource teacher will provide training, coaching cycles,			

			and assist with instructional planning and assessment. The math resource will also provide small group instruction to targeted students.			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$68,493.47
			Notes: The reading coach will help build teacher capacity and expertise. The reading coach will provide training, coaching cycles, and planning support to build staff knowledge of best practices in reading instruction.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$67,344.46
			Notes: The reading resource teacher will support teachers with planning, build staff knowledge in specific areas of reading instruction, and support small group instruction for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.			
	5100	510-Supplies	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,189.38
			Notes: Classroom Supplies(chart paper, markers, student journals, copy paper, card stock, pencils, professional resources, text sets) will be purchased to be used during professional development sessions and to implement instructional strategies in the classroom with students.			
	5100	210-Retirement	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$5,607.15
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher Retirement 8.47%			
	5100	220-Social Security	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$4,104.41
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher FICA 6.2%			
	5100	220-Social Security	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$959.90
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher Medicare 1.45%			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$337.62
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher Workers Comp .51%			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$12,578.02
			Notes: Math Resource Health Ins 19.00%			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	1081 - Desoto Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,631.72
			Notes: T-payroll for PD and Planning for teachers Provide professional learning and planning opportunities beyond the contracted day for 25- k-5 and ESE teachers in effective lesson planning that results in increases student engagement in reading and math. Teachers will engage in additional collaborative planning sessions and Professional Learning Community sessions for 1 hours per week that will take place over 8 weeks.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1081 - Desoto Elementary School			\$0.00
Total:						\$239,625.43