# Folsom Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
ambitious
mission
school improvement
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
relationships
teaching
success
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
resources
growth

## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Folsom Elementary School

## 9855 HARNEY RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

### [ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Jennifer Penney                    Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: D (40%)<br><br>2017-18: D (39%)<br><br>2016-17: D (40%)<br><br>2015-16: D (38%) |
| **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

# Folsom Elementary School

## 9855 HARNEY RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

### [ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | Yes | 93% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 83% |

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

We support the Hillsborough County School District's vision of 'Preparing Students for Life' we Folsom Elementary are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Students will demonstrate academic proficiency and responsible citizenship.

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

Every student, every day, college bound.

### School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Babanats, Melissa | Principal | Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making<br>Leadership team meetings can include the following:<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator<br>Guidance Counselor<br>SAC Chairs<br>School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative<br>School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative<br>Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis)<br>ESE teachers<br>PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area<br>District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches)<br><br>The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:<br>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.<br>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.<br>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.<br>4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.<br><br>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| | | 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 training's 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.

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Jennifer Penney

**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.*
6

**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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (38%) |
| **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 | 67 | 68 | 83 | 64 | 54 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 398 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 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 | 91 | 69 | 65 | 88 | 81 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 477 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 17 | 17 | 26 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 42 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 42 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |

**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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |

**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 | |

**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 | 91 | 69 | 65 | 88 | 81 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 477 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 17 | 17 | 26 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 42 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 42 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |

**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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |

**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 | |

## 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 | 36% | 52% | 57% | 38% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 55% | 58% | 44% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 62% | 50% | 53% | 40% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 39% | 54% | 63% | 29% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 39% | 57% | 62% | 48% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 24% | 46% | 51% | 45% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 25% | 50% | 53% | 39% | 48% | 51% |

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

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

**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 | 33% | 52% | -19% | 58% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 53% | -20% | 57% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 40% | 55% | -15% | 58% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 55% | -32% | 56% | -33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 27% | 54% | -27% | 56% | -29% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 51% | -17% | 55% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

### MATH

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 03 | 2019 | 46% | 54% | -8% | 62% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 55% | -7% | 62% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 33% | 57% | -24% | 64% | -31% |
| | 2018 | 24% | 57% | -33% | 62% | -38% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 30% | 54% | -24% | 60% | -30% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 54% | -2% | 61% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -22% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

### SCIENCE

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 05 | 2019 | 23% | 51% | -28% | 53% | -30% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 30% | 52% | -22% | 55% | -25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 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 | 16 | 50 | 56 | 26 | 35 | 30 | 11 | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 37 | | 36 | 32 | 18 | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 53 | 61 | 32 | 40 | 32 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 46 | | 39 | 31 | | 23 | | | | |
| MUL | 29 | 80 | | 29 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 67 | | 51 | 37 | | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 56 | 64 | 39 | 36 | 24 | 24 | | | | |
| 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 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 43 | 31 | | | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 32 | | 48 | 42 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 27 | 23 | 26 | 42 | 36 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 51 | 55 | 53 | 61 | 45 | 44 | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | 33 | | 58 | 70 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 33 | 30 | 41 | 54 | 36 | 31 | | | | |
| 2017 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 | 9 | 27 | 20 | 9 | 27 | | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 39 | 38 | 18 | 48 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 37 | 35 | 19 | 34 | 27 | 27 | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 40 | 46 | 30 | 52 | 70 | 20 | | | | |
| MUL | 23 | | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 62 | | 42 | 69 | | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 43 | 35 | 27 | 46 | 45 | 40 | | | | |

## 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 59 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 340 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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 | 38 |
| 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 | 41 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 47 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Math bottom quartile at 24% proficiency

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

The data component that had the greatest decline from the prior year was Math learning gains declining by 16%.

**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.**

Science reflects the greatest gap compared to the state average. The contributing factors include the absence of a certified teacher the most of the year as well as students' inability to read on-level non-fiction text.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA lowest 25th percentile. The actions taken to address this area were instructional planning that positively affected standard based instruction; also the integration of weekly student data analysis.

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

The number of students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessment is a n area of concern.

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

1. ELA CORE
2. MATH CORE
3. BOTTOM QUARTILE
4. SCIENCE CORE
5.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Teachers are struggling with understanding standards based instruction developing and implementation. Many of our students come to us with deficiencies due to trauma. Teachers struggle to motivate and engage students because of this factor. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our goal is to achieve 54% or higher in proficiency for ELA and Math statewide assessment. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Deena Ham (deena.ham@sdhc.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We will use instructional coaching and professional learning communities as the strategies to monitor our area of focus. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | This strategy was chosen to reflect the needs of students and demonstrate the use of instructional systems that drive student progression. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Standard based instruction, supported by expertise of content coaches. Coaches will also focus on providing and modeling additional strategies to assist teachers with Black, SWD, and ELL students.
2. Authentic student engagement. Culturally and relevant text will also be used for instruction with Black, SWD, and ELL students.
3. Professional Development. Addition professional development will be offered and provided that will target specific strategies and instructional practices to increase students achievement in Black, SWD, and ELL sub groups.
4. Differentiated structures , including assistance from aides to work with small groups/individuals targeted for additional support. Students in the Black, SWD, and ELL subgroups will be provided assistance from aides and resource teachers to increase student achievement.
5. Assessment alignment.
* All action steps will be based on data collected and heavy emphasis on the data collected for our Black, SWD, and ELL students.

| **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.

**We will address the remaining school-wide improvement priorities through our systems of interventions and daily one hour collaborative planning sessions.**

## 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.

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

### 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: ELA | | | | $194,655.15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $65,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Salary-RTI Teacher will be responsible for Identify students who are in need of differentiated support and put a plan in place for each student going through the RTI process. They will also meet to reassess student data monthly to identify if interventions from the toolkit are working and develop next steps. | | | |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $58,200.00 |
| | | | Notes: Salary-Reading Resource will complete grade level planning sessions to attend on a biweekly basis. Weekly Meetings with Academic Coaches and Administration to ensure integrity of the planning process and to support weekly implementation of instruction and assessment. Resource will also review weekly student achievement data to adjust instruction and support. | | | |
| | 5100 | 210-Retirement | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $4,059.21 |
| | | | Notes: RTI Teacher Retirement 8.47% | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $2,971.32 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *Notes: RTI Teacher FICA 6.2%* | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $694.91 |
| | | | *Notes: RTI Teacher Medicare 1.45%* | | | |
| | 5100 | 240-Workers Compensation | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $244.41 |
| | | | *Notes: RTI Teacher Workers Comp .51%* | | | |
| | 5100 | 231-Health and Hospitalization | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $9,105.66 |
| | | | *Notes: RTI Teacher Health Ins 19%* | | | |
| | 5100 | 210-Retirement | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $3,634.56 |
| | | | *Notes: Reading Resource Retirement 8.47%* | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $622.21 |
| | | | *Notes: Reading Resource Medicare 1.45%* | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $2,660.48 |
| | | | *Notes: Reading Resource FICA 6.2%* | | | |
| | 5100 | 240-Workers Compensation | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $218.55 |
| | | | *Notes: Reading Resource Workers Comp .51%* | | | |
| | 5100 | 231-Health and Hospitalization | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | $8,153.08 |
| | | | *Notes: Reading Resource Health Ins 19%* | | | |
| | 6400 | 390-Other Purchased Services | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | | $4,684.78 |
| | | | *Notes: Substitutes for planning sessions/professional development. 30 teachers will participate in planning session on identified scheduled days. Their will be 1 day per semester (November and February).* | | | |
| | 6300 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | | $8,428.07 |
| | | | *Notes: A team consisting of reading coach, reading resource, 2 teachers to plan for utilizing Florida ELA standards to access content in Florida Science and 2 teachers to plan for Florida Social Studies standards. This team will study standards, gather resources, and develop a scope and sequence for grades 2-5 for ELA/science/social studies. The team will determine appropriate topics, standards, community based problem, and field work for grades 2-5.* | | | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | | $10,040.31 |
| | | | *Notes: Teachers will need access to a variety of materials in order to develop high quality lessons and students to complete high quality work. These materials will include binders, binder clips, paper clips, copy paper, chart paper, pencils, pens, crayons, expo markers, chart paper markers, post it notes, index cards, folders, highlighters, page protectors, tab dividers, notebook paper, rulers, colored pencils, permanent markers, vinyal, easers, replacement blades and mates for dia-cut machine, card stock, construction papers, lamination rolls/sheets, toner, ink, rolls of poster papr, rolls of butcher paper, spiral notebooks, tape. The estimated cost is $10,000.00, these supplies will impact 60 instructional units.* | | | |

| | 5100 | 519-Technology-Related Supplies | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | | $13,000.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *Notes: Purchase materials/digital programs to support instructional gaps. Scholastic News K-5Scholastics News (K-5) Engaging scholars in high level robust text across content disciplines. Scholars will have access to digital magazine as well hard copies that can be used for reading during home use. This magazine subscription is available in multiple level text and will encourage scholars to make real world connections across the discipline.* | | | |
| | 6400 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1471 - Folsom Elementary School | UniSIG | | $2,937.60 |
| | | | *Notes: The book studies will take place during faculty meetings with follow up activities. The administrators and resource teachers will lead the PD trainings. Data Driven Book 30 at 20.00 = 600, Game Changer 30 at $16.86=505.20, Creating a Culture of Reflective Practice 30 at $22.75 = 682.50, and Reading Nonfiction Notice and Note Stances, Signoposts, and Strategies 30 at 38.33=1149.90 = 2937.60* | | | |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$200,806.25** |