

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mango 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Mango Elementary School

4220 HWY 579, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sabrina Ruiz

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2020

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* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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	18

Mango Elementary School

4220 HWY 579, Seffner, FL 33584

[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	81%

School Grades History

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

Every student will believe, achieve, and succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

Every student will reach their highest potential.

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
Davis, Felicia	Principal	My leadership team and I drive school improvement efforts. My team includes myself, my Assistant Principal for Elementary Instruction, Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, Psychologist, RtI Data Coach, content area coaches, and team representatives. We meet regularly to address academic achievement and a focus on learning as well as progress monitoring.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/17/2020, Sabrina Ruiz

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.*

13

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* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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	103	104	117	106	110	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	26	30	34	30	29	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	36	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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	38%	52%	57%	37%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	58%	39%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	50%	53%	43%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	28%	54%	63%	39%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	27%	57%	62%	42%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%	46%	51%	31%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	50%	53%	38%	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	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	55%	-23%	58%	-26%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	32%	51%	-19%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	30%	54%	-24%	62%	-32%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	21%	57%	-36%	64%	-43%
	2018	35%	57%	-22%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2019	29%	54%	-25%	60%	-31%
	2018	30%	54%	-24%	61%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	39	32	16	29	19	40				
ELL	24	38	42	19	16	7	35				
BLK	28	45	35	16	26	33	28				
HSP	36	46	44	32	26	6	46				
MUL	33			25							
WHT	52	59	36	32	27	13	46				
FRL	36	49	40	26	25	19	40				
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	18	35	21	23	34	31	23				
ELL	32	47	36	26	36	35	15				
BLK	33	49	47	19	38	43	19				
HSP	46	47	32	40	41	50	35				
MUL	50										
WHT	45	46	54	47	42	15	58				
FRL	42	47	44	35	40	37	35				
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	14	36	33	14	24	26					
ELL	19	32	33	32	41	37	9				
BLK	31	32	46	26	31	38	29				
HSP	36	41	30	43	49	33	38				
MUL	43			36							
WHT	43	40	56	44	42	15	40				
FRL	34	37	43	36	40	28	36				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	302
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
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.

Overall 77% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored below proficiency in reading according to iReady Reading Diagnostic 1. Students' independent comprehension of grade level texts is not adequate because students have not mastered grade level standards. Students are not given consistently given grade appropriate tasks that are aligned to the standard. This may be due to teachers not having clarity around appropriate tasks, texts, and standard(s) alignment.

Overall 88% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored below proficiency in math according to iReady Math Diagnostic 1. Students' independent comprehension and application of grade level math concepts are not adequate. Students are not consistently given grade appropriate tasks and instruction and align to the standard. This may be due to teachers not having clarity around appropriate tasks, Learning Ladders and Standards alignment.

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

Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. There is a disconnect between the instructional support and the implementation of Learning Ladders/Critical Area Assessments used by Achievement schools. Some contributing factors include: New math coach, new assessments, new strategies/ Learning Ladders, intermediate instructional positions unfilled until mid-year, and inexperienced teachers in intermediate instructional positions. Teachers were also resistant to a structure of common planning time and did not consistently look at grade level data to address student needs.

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.

Math achievement and learning gains equally showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Students have not mastered grade level standards, were not consistently given grade appropriate tasks and instruction that align to the standard(s), and teachers may not have clarity around appropriate tasks, Learning Ladders and standard(s) alignment. There is a disconnect between the instructional support and the implementation of Learning Ladders/Critical Area Assessments used by Achievement schools. Some contributing factors include: New math coach, new assessments, new strategies/Learning Ladders, intermediate instructional positions unfilled until mid-year, and inexperienced teachers in intermediate instructional positions. Teachers were also resistant to a structure of common planning time and did not consistently look at grade level data to address student needs.

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

Data showed Science as having the most improvement. A Science instructional coach has been hired to plan with grade 3, 4, and 5 Science teachers as well as complete instructional coaching cycles as needed based on data and observation.

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

There is a high percentage of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 performing below grade level expectations and recommended for retention based on iReady reading diagnostics and growth monitoring assessments, DRA2, formative reading assessments and teacher observation.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Reading Gains
4. Math Gains
5. Standards Based Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Overall average Federal Index of ESSA categories for White, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged ESSA subgroups was 38% (under 41%)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Teacher clarity of standards and task alignment in order to ensure strong instruction that yields mastery of grade level standards focused on White, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged ESSA subgroups. Students' independent comprehension of grade level texts is not adequate and overall 77% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored below proficiency in reading according to iReady Reading Diagnostic 1.

Students' independent comprehension and application of grade level math concepts are not adequate. Overall 88% of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 scored below proficiency in math according to iReady Math Diagnostic 1.

30% of students in grades 3-5 will perform on or above grade level as measured by iReady Reading and Math diagnostic 2 administered in January 2021.

50% of students in grades 3-5 will perform on or above grade level as measured by iReady Reading and Math diagnostic 3 administered in Spring 2021.

Measurable Outcome:

By January 2021, teacher clarity (alignment of standards to lesson delivery and outcomes) will be evident in at least 40% of the classrooms. Baseline data to be collected within the first month of the 20-21 school year.

By May 2021, teacher clarity (alignment of standards to lesson delivery and outcomes) will be evident in at least 80% of the classrooms.

By January 2021, as measured by common assessments at least 41% of White, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged students will score in the proficient ranges.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelli Coleman (kelli.coleman@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

With the support of reading and math personnel, (Reading coach, reading resource teachers, math Coach, assistant teacher, and paras), grades 3, 4, and 5 will meet weekly to plan standards aligned lessons, including a focus on clarity related to appropriate tasks, success criteria, and standards alignment for the following subgroups The White, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged. Modeling, co-teaching, and coaching cycles will be implemented where necessary. RTI/Data Coach will provide data support to the grade levels in planning lessons responsive to student needs and monitor school-wide data in order to help meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students are not consistently given grade appropriate tasks and instruction that align to the standard because there is inconsistent planning that includes texts, tasks and student success criteria that results in standards mastery. Teachers may not have clarity around appropriate tasks, texts, Learning Ladders (math) and standard(s) alignment. There is a disconnect between instructional support and the implementation of Learning Ladders/ Critical Needs Assessments used by Achievement schools (Math).

Action Steps to Implement

- a. All instructional staff positions should be filled, allowing resource teachers to support classroom teachers effectively through planning and coaching. This includes qualified instructional support personnel, including coaches and resource teachers.
- b. Master schedule will provide common planning time for teachers of the same content area.
- c. Teachers will use resources such as the Common Core Companion, item specs and ALD's when planning
- d. Content coaches in the areas of reading, writing, science and math will support teachers with their understanding of the standards to be taught.
- e. Tasks and questions will be shared during these sessions. The alignment of the tasks to the standards being taught will be discussed.
- f. Informal assessments to monitor clarity around appropriate tasks, texts, Learning Ladders (math) and standard(s) alignment will be created and discussed

Monitoring: Walkthroughs to look for implementation of clarity as it relates to standards-aligned tasks; common assessment data

Person Responsible Felicia Davis (felicia.davis@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Leadership and administration will create a classroom look-for criteria checklist addressing teacher clarity of standards aligned instruction, lesson outcomes and create a schedule for walk throughs. Leadership and administration will communicate look-fors to faculty. Administration will conduct consistent walk-throughs, follow-ups and data collection to ensure implementation of planned grade level appropriate lessons and communicate trends to individual teachers and faculty. Data from walk throughs will be utilized by content area coaches to identify needed support and develop coaching plans for White, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. Administration will monitor progress towards coaching plans and established goals.

Person Responsible Felicia Davis (felicia.davis@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Administration will create a common schedule for grade level facilitated planning time with content coaches that allows for adequate engagement in all aspects of effective standards based planning. Leadership and administration will communicate the roles, responsibilities and expectations for before planning, during planning, planning outcomes and data analysis by all (admin., coaches, teachers) to faculty. Use T-payroll where necessary for additional planning sessions, outside of teacher work hours. Administration will attend PLC's to monitor roles and implementation.

Person Responsible Kimberly Parke (kimberly.parke@hcps.net)

Ensure that teachers and students have necessary (supplemental) supplies and materials to aid in instruction and standards mastery focused on White, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups.

Person Responsible Kimberly Parke (kimberly.parke@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

There is a high percentage of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 performing below grade level expectations and recommended for retention based on iReady reading diagnostics and growth monitoring assessments, DRA2, formative reading assessments and teacher observation. With the support of reading personnel, (Reading coaches and Reading Resource teachers), grades 3, 4, and 5 will meet weekly to plan standards aligned lessons. Reading coach and Resource will also model and coach as needed. RTI/MTSS Resource will have a structured schedule to meet with individual teachers specifically to discuss and provide intervention strategies and data support regarding specific students identified as not mastering grade appropriate standards.

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.

School staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. Parent Liaison will work to bridge the gap between parents and teachers to support student achievement. We work hard at building positive relationships with our families and community partners. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home flyers, making parent link phone calls, emails and texts, utilizing social media and our website to post relevant information. We make every effort to communicate every child's progress to the parent or guardian by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent-teacher conferences. Mango is a Leader in Me school. This is a comprehensive school improvement model that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive in the 21st century. All settings are structured for success, expectations for student behavior are explicitly taught through PBIS, monthly Seven Habits character skill building and daily through the Leader in Me program.

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				\$593,139.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$56,000.10
			<i>Notes: Salary Rtl Data Coach - Will be responsible for data compiling, analysis, planning and intervention support for teachers of grades K-5. Will also provide data support to the grade levels in planning lessons responsive to student needs and monitor school-wide data in order to help meet the needs of all students.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$50,200.13
			<i>Notes: Salary Reading Resource Teacher - Will support and monitor the implementation of rigorous lessons, including but not limited to; conducting coaching cycles, co-teaching and modeling lessons. The resource teacher will lead teachers in standards based planning, and will also teach students in skill specific small groups in grades 3-5.</i>			
	6120	150-Aides	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$16,023.00
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison - Salary Will be responsible for bridging the gap between parents and teachers to support student achievement.</i>			
	5100	150-Aides	2721 - Mango Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$24,150.52
			<i>Notes: Assistant Teacher BD Level - Salary Will assist with small group instruction for all content areas as needed.</i>			
			2721 - Mango Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$86,677.96
			<i>Notes: Reading Resource Teacher: Primary - Will support and monitor the implementation of rigorous lessons, including but not limited to; conducting coaching cycles, co-teaching and modeling lessons. The resource teacher will lead teachers in standards based planning, and will also teach students in skill specific small groups, including, but not limited to; phonics and foundational skills.</i>			
			2721 - Mango Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$63,173.52
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach - Will support and monitor the implementation of rigorous lessons, including but not limited to; conducting coaching cycles, co-teaching and modeling lessons. The coach will lead teachers in standards based planning, and will also teach students in skill specific small groups in grades 3-5.</i>			
			2721 - Mango Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$63,173.52
			<i>Notes: Science Resource Teacher - Will support and monitor the implementation of rigorous lessons, including but not limited to; co-teaching and modeling lessons. The resource teacher will lead teachers in standards based planning, and will also teach students in skill specific small groups, as well as demonstration lessons by class.</i>			
			2721 - Mango Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$26,182.60
			<i>Notes: Paraprofessional - Will assist with student small group instruction in all subject areas. Will focus on foundational skills and phonics.</i>			
			2721 - Mango Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$17,962.96
			<i>Notes: Classroom Materials and Supplies for teacher and student use. These materials will aid in instruction and be used to plan for and deliver rigorous lessons to yield student mastery of standards.</i>			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG		\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: TPayroll: Through instructional duties added, teachers will work in PLC's to review data and plan for rigorous lessons that will result in mastery of standards by students. Planning sessions will be held before and/or after work hours. 60 teachers for 5hrs/wk for four weeks @ \$35/hr = \$42,000 Planning for PBIS training team: 8 x \$35 x 6hrs = \$1680</i>			

			2721 - Mango Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$5,205.75
			Notes: Parent and family Engagement: As mandated by ESSA Section 1116 meaningful activities will be conducted to provide the communication and support necessary to assist and build the capacity of all families and staff in planning and implementing effective parent and family involvement activities to improve student academic achievement and school performance. Activities may include, but not limited to; materials, supplies, printing, family night/meeting resources, food as allowed.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$64,000.09
			Notes: Math Resource Salary- Will support and monitor the implementation of rigorous lessons, including but not limited to; conducting coaching cycles, co-teaching and modeling lessons. The coach will lead teachers in standards based planning, and will also teach students in skill specific small groups in grades 3-5.			
	5100	510-Supplies	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG		\$10,824.76
			Notes: Classroom Materials and Supplies for teacher and student use. These materials will aid in instruction and be used to plan for and deliver rigorous lessons to yield student mastery of standards.			
	5100	210-Retirement	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$4,743.21
			Notes: Retirement 8.47% Rtl Data Coach -			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$3,472.01
			Notes: FICA 6.2% Rtl Data Coach -			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$812.00
			Notes: Medicare 1.45% Rtl Data Coach -			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$285.60
			Notes: Workers Comp .51% Rtl Data Coach -			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$10,640.02
			Notes: Health Ins 19% Rtl Data Coach -			
	5100	210-Retirement	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$4,251.95
			Notes: Retirement 8.47% Reading Resource Teacher -			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$3,112.41
			Notes: FICA 6.2% Reading Resource Teacher -			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$727.90
			Notes: Medicare 1.45% Reading Resource Teacher -			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$256.02
			Notes: Workers Comp .51% Reading Resource Teacher -			

	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$9,538.02
			<i>Notes: Health Ins 19% Reading Resource Teacher -</i>			
	6120	210-Retirement	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$1,357.15
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison - Retirement 8.47%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$993.43
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison - FICA 6.2%</i>			
	6120	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$232.33
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison - Medicare 1.45%</i>			
	6120	240-Workers Compensation	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$81.72
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison - Workers Comp .51%</i>			
	6120	231-Health and Hospitalization	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$3,044.37
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison - Health Ins 19%</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$2,112.30
			<i>Notes: Assistant Teacher BD Level - Retirement 8.47%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School		1.0	\$1,546.19
			<i>Notes: Assistant Teacher BD Level - FICA 6.2%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School		1.0	\$361.61
			<i>Notes: Assistant Teacher BD Level - Medicare 1.45%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	2721 - Mango Elementary School		1.0	\$127.19
			<i>Notes: Assistant Teacher BD Level - Workers Comp .51%</i>			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	2721 - Mango Elementary School		1.0	\$4,414.13
			<i>Notes: Assistant Teacher BD Level - Health Ins 17.7%</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$5,420.81
			<i>Notes: Math Resource Retirement 8.47%-</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$3,968.01
			<i>Notes: Math Resource FICA 6.2%-</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$928.00
			<i>Notes: Math Resource Medicare 1.45%-</i>			

	5100	240-Workers Compensation	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$326.40
			<i>Notes: Math Resource Workers Comp .51%-</i>			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$12,160.02
			<i>Notes: Math Resource Health Ins 19%</i>			
	6300	210-Retirement	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,270.50
			<i>Notes: TPayroll: Retirement 8.47% Through instructional duties added, teachers will work in PLC's to review data and plan for rigorous lessons that will result in mastery of standards by students. Planning sessions will be held before and/or after work hours. 60 teachers for 5hrs/wk for four weeks @ \$35/hr = \$42,000 Planning for PBIS training team: 8 x \$35 x 6hrs = \$1680</i>			
	6300	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG		\$930.00
			<i>Notes: TPayroll: FICA 6.2% Through instructional duties added, teachers will work in PLC's to review data and plan for rigorous lessons that will result in mastery of standards by students. Planning sessions will be held before and/or after work hours. 60 teachers for 5hrs/wk for four weeks @ \$35/hr = \$42,000 Planning for PBIS training team: 8 x \$35 x 6hrs = \$1680</i>			
	6300	220-Social Security	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG		\$217.50
			<i>Notes: TPayroll: Medicare 1.45% Through instructional duties added, teachers will work in PLC's to review data and plan for rigorous lessons that will result in mastery of standards by students. Planning sessions will be held before and/or after work hours. 60 teachers for 5hrs/wk for four weeks @ \$35/hr = \$42,000 Planning for PBIS training team: 8 x \$35 x 6hrs = \$1680</i>			
	6300	240-Workers Compensation	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG		\$76.50
			<i>Notes: TPayroll: Workers Comp .51% Through instructional duties added, teachers will work in PLC's to review data and plan for rigorous lessons that will result in mastery of standards by students. Planning sessions will be held before and/or after work hours. 60 teachers for 5hrs/wk for four weeks @ \$35/hr = \$42,000 Planning for PBIS training team: 8 x \$35 x 6hrs = \$1680</i>			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	2721 - Mango Elementary School	UniSIG		\$17,156.99
			<i>Notes: The 24 laptops will be used to support teacher instruction in the classroom. The teachers will be able to provide support to their students in Elearning as well as on campus learning. They will also be able to track their students' data from Achieve 3000 and iReady.</i>			
Total:						\$602,082.20