

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Dorothy Thomas Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Dorothy Thomas Center

3215 NUNDY RD, Tampa, FL 33618

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Simmons

Start Date for this Principal: 1/30/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special 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* Black/African American Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Dorothy Thomas Center

3215 NUNDY RD, Tampa, FL 33618

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Special Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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.

To reach each student by cultivating excellence in every child's tailored academic, social, emotional, and career growth in order to increase our graduation rate through a quality, comprehensive educational and therapeutic approach.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students to make responsible, positive choices in every aspect of their lives.

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
Jahn, Kimberly	Principal	Mrs. Jahn is responsible for supervising and leading the school leadership team. Mrs. Jahn also leads the assistant principal to provide instructional leadership to all teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/30/2017, Kelly Simmons

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special 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* Black/African American Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	0	5	5	0	4	3	0	4	2	7	4	5	5	44
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	0	2	1	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	1	1	6	3	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4	0	2	2	0	2	16

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	1	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	0	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	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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0%	57%	61%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	54%	0%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	55%	62%	0%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	57%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	52%	0%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	50%	56%	0%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	78%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	17%	54%	-37%	52%	-35%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
08	2019	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	57%	-57%	64%	-64%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	15%	62%	-47%	54%	-39%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	0%	31%	-31%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	29%	-29%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	47%	-47%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	17%	67%	-50%	71%	-54%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	71%	-71%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		17%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	73%	-73%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	18	43		14	31		10				
BLK	21	57		8	17						
WHT	9			23							
FRL	19	44		13	30						
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
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

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	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	116
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Hispanic Students	
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	16
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	27
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Our students continue to struggle in English Language Arts especially in the area of literacy. Utilizing iReady data and classroom assessments, it appears that identifying the main idea and supporting details should be an area of focus along with increasing vocabulary. Students also need to increase skills in data and statistics in the area of math.

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

Our students continue to struggle in English Language Arts especially in the area of literacy. Utilizing iReady data and classroom assessments, it appears that identifying the main idea and supporting details should be an area of focus along with increasing vocabulary. Students also need to increase skills in data and statistics in the area of math.

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

Our students continue to struggle in English Language Arts. When the data was drilled down, it appears that identifying the main idea and supporting details should be an area of focus along with increasing vocabulary. Students also need to increase skills in data and statistics in the area of math.

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

Students improved in craft and structure in English Language Arts and showed a slight improvement in numbers and operations, and expressions and equations in math.

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

Our students continue to struggle in English Language Arts. When the data was drilled down, it appears that identifying the main idea and supporting details should be an area of focus along with increasing vocabulary. Students also need to increase skills in data and statistics in the area of math.

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

1. Provide high quality, standards base instruction
2. Enhance student engagement with purposeful differentiated strategies
3. Reduce suspension rates with use of PBIS strategies
4. Improve student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: As a school we need to continue to collaborate, share and implement strategies that will result in high quality, standards-based instruction and maximize student learning in our classrooms.

Measurable Outcome: Teachers in all grade levels and subject areas will provide high quality, standards-based instruction to focus on developing valuable skills and enhance student engagement resulting in increased academic achievement as evidenced by learning gains which earn a "Commendable" school rating.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Jahn (kimberly.jahn@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated Instruction, PLCs, Learning Walks, Strategy Share, Instructor Spotlight

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies are used to allow teachers to grow professionally and maximize student learning in the classroom. Student performance, on common assessments, formative assessments, and standardized assessments will be used to determine teacher effectiveness.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.) Educate teachers on differentiated instruction through PLCs, Learning Walks, and professional development
- 2.) Students will collaborate with their teachers to improve their academic performance through data chats.
- 3.) Families will collaborate with teachers to support student learning by attending academic nights and conference night.
- 4.) African American (black), Caucasian (white),SWD (students with disabilities will receive accommodations and interventions to include one on one assistance to increase academic performance in the classroom.

Person Responsible Kimberly Jahn (kimberly.jahn@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a school, we want to continue to work on improving student behaviors and social emotional functioning in order to create productive students and citizens.
Measurable Outcome:	All faculty and staff will use a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports program to increase student compliance, behavior and overall social and emotional functioning resulting in a 5% decrease of out of school suspensions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Jahn (kimberly.jahn@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS school wide program, point level system, student incentives program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies, programs and tools will enable faculty and staff to increase positive behaviors and decrease negative emotional reactions and outburst by our students which impacts the learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.) Faculty, staff and students will participate in school-wide PBIS program
- 2.) Faculty, staff and families will use Kickboard, an electronic PBIS recording system, to monitor student behavioral progress
- 3.) Faculty, staff and community partners will provide student incentives tied to student progress on the PBIS program.

Person Responsible Kimberly Jahn (kimberly.jahn@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a school, we want to improve our student attendance rate in order to increase student exposure to academic instruction and positive behavioral supports.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2020-2021 school year, student attendance will be closely monitored and interventions will be put in place to increase school average by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Jahn (kimberly.jahn@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District attendance monitoring procedures, Increased parent communication, PBIS program, student incentives program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will increase student attendance by keeping the families involved and by creating a school climate and culture conducive to students desiring to be present at school daily.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.) Create flyers to distribute to parents/guardians regarding the importance of student attendance
- 2.) Support School Social Worker in efforts to utilize district procedures regarding monitoring student attendance
- 3.) Provide student incentives tied to attendance

Person Responsible Kimberly Jahn (kimberly.jahn@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will assist Principal Jahn with monitoring the Areas of Focus identified above as these encompass the schoolwide improvement priorities.

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.

The school plans on building positive relationships with parents, guardians, families and other community stakeholders by sending frequent Remind messages to inform them of school-related events like Open House, Academic Nights and Conference Night. Increased communication with families is a priority school wide. Teachers are encouraged to make at least 3 positive parent calls per week to enhance relationships with parents and guardians.

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				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3240		4321 - Dorothy Thomas Center	Title, I Part C		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Kickboard electronic point system</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	3240		4321 - Dorothy Thomas Center	Title, I Part C		\$2,000.00	
			<i>Notes: Color laser printer</i>				
						Total:	\$3,500.00