Carrollwood K 8 School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Carrollwood K 8 School

3516 MCFARLAND RD, Tampa, FL 33618

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Maryjo Stover

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Carrollwood K 8 School

3516 MCFARLAND RD, Tampa, FL 33618

[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)
Combination School PK-8	No	49%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

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

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.

Carrollwood Elementary School will be a leader in developing high performing students who are prepared for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Carrollwood Elementary School will prepare students for life.

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
Stover, Mary Jo	Principal	Maintain the campus and the instructional responsibilities of students and staff.
Testoni, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in monitoring and maintaining the campus and instructional learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/4/2020, Maryjo Stover

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.*
2

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
64

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	88	115	105	101	105	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	11	3	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	1	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	129	118	111	124	106	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	8	7	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	14	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	14	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	129	118	111	124	106	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	8	7	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	14	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	14	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	71%	57%	61%	68%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	59%	60%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	52%	54%	40%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	64%	55%	62%	64%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%	57%	59%	60%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	49%	52%	52%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	66%	50%	56%	59%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	78%	75%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
	2018	70%	53%	17%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
	2018	75%	55%	20%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
	2018	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	57%	7%	64%	0%
	2018	74%	57%	17%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	57%	54%	3%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	39	44	32	37	37	16	36				
ELL	33	32	18	33	29	22					
ASN	83	60		92	73						
BLK	54	63		50	26	20					
HSP	63	56	30	58	49	32	72				
MUL	64	50		43	30						
WHT	79	54	39	71	53	26	70				
FRL	55	50	31	43	35	28	44				
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	30	45	46	31	36	26	25				
ELL	50	71	75	57	57	36	27				
ASN	88			94							
BLK	53	55		36	32		45				
HSP	67	64	66	61	56	46	50				
MUL	54	25		63	42						
WHT	76	63	38	76	60	20	76				
FRL	57	57	53	54	49	41	45				
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	28	33	28	26	42	39	11				
ELL	34	52	46	44	71	65					
ASN	93	83		87	75						
BLK	48	56		48	44						
HSP	62	54	35	59	61	61	58				
MUL	69	67		81	83						
WHT	73	63	46	67	57	45	57				
FRL	52	52	44	50	59	55	44				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	35
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	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	56
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	45
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.

Math overall is lower than ELA in proficiency points and learning gains. Contributing factors include: limited physical resources, new math curriculum with limited support/training.

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

Math learning gains from Formative 2 assessment was down 1% point from the 2019 Math FSA, 34% from 35%
We are comparing midyear progress to end of the year progress.

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.

We don't have state average to compare at this time.

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

Science Formative 2 given in December showed the greatest gain for proficiency from a 66% on the 2019 Spring FSA to 83% on the formative 2 assessment. This is due to multiple Science teachers who are highly effective in this content area. Also our school focus was on STEAM and we had an increase in resources for teachers to utilize during instruction.

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

ELA proficiency in the area of SWD on Iready in December 2019, showed us down one percentage point from a 39% to 38% compared to Spring 2019 FSA ELA.

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

1. Low 25% in ELA
2. Low 25% in Math
3. Increasing overall learning gains in math
4. ELL subgroup
5. SWD subgroup

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By aligning the task to the rigor of the standard, will increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:	By increasing student achievement, particularly in the bottom quartile, it will allow us to narrow the achievement gap, therefore more students will become proficient in their expected grade level and be better prepared for higher education.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Jo Stover (maryjo.stover@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Focus planning aligned to standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	task must align to the learning targets. task must align to the standards. academic language is evident focus on success criteria and assessment

Action Steps to Implement

Common standard based planning
Backwards lesson planning
Identify Success criteria
Instruction should be based upon pre and post assessments given.

Person Responsible	Matthew Testoni (matthew.testoni@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data shows from the 2018-2019 school year that students in the ESSA subgroups of ELL and SWD fell below the 41%. We attributed to that teachers weren't fully aligning the standards to the instruction and had to learn how to unpack the standard in order to plan for instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	In ELA, SWD scored below the 41% target goal for subgroups for ELA achievement at 39% and for math at 37% The BQ for ELA was at 32% and math at16% In the category of ELL, ELA achievement at 33% and form math 33%. The BQ for ELL ELA was 18% and for math 16%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Testoni (matthew.testoni@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leadership team will meet weekly to review data and identify the students who are in the BQ. Grouping of students has been established to meet their needs for scheduling VE and ELL services. Trainings on unpacking the standards and standard based alignment were offered in the 2019-2020 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy because we are seeing more and more of our ELL and SWD students not make learning gains which is preventing the students to receive the high quality instruction needed to close the achievement gap and is hindering us from receiving a higher school grade.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 continue to meet weekly to review data and student progress along with students with early warning indicators. PLCs and data meetings will happen monthly along with on site professional development.

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.

Character trait word of the month is presented over the morning show. Teachers are provided lessons that they can incorporate with their students in addition to the school counselor presenting monthly lessons. Mindful Learning Time is incorporated into the daily schedule for teachers to meet with their students at the start of the day. Positive Behavior Intervention Support program is being implemented school wide and grade level teachers meet monthly to review behavior data and to plan for quarterly incentive celebrations. Restorative practice is conducted monthly for a Behavior Support Students and used after a suspension. Students who are having a difficult time emotionally, academically, or socially are provided a Check and Connect mentor.

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00