Davis Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Davis Elementary School

10907 MEMORIAL HWY, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Patrick Lalone   Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2012

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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

Davis Elementary School

10907 MEMORIAL HWY, Tampa, FL 33615

[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	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will provide opportunities for students to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to ensure a standard of excellence in developing each student, academically, emotionally and socially.

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
LaLone, Patrick	Principal	Ensure the goals and activities of this SIP are conveyed to parents, staff, and community. To also ensure the implementation of all activities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 9/1/2012, Patrick Lalone

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.*
6

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	64	95	82	97	100	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	7	27	20	16	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	4	16	2	5	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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
Wednesday 10/28/2020

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	75	92	102	105	100	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	13	15	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	5	29	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Retained Students: Current Year	3	10	10	7	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Number of students enrolled	75	92	102	105	100	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	13	15	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	5	29	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Retained Students: Current Year	3	10	10	7	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
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	49%	52%	57%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	55%	58%	56%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	38%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	54%	63%	48%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	57%	62%	54%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	46%	51%	34%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	50%	53%	37%	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	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
	2018	53%	51%	2%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	57%	-17%	64%	-24%
	2018	46%	57%	-11%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	60%	-9%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	27	42	38	27	38	23	24				
ELL	42	54	53	41	54	37	39				
BLK	30	46		40	48		27				
HSP	49	58	49	45	49	33	45				
WHT	49	58	54	60	69		65				
FRL	47	57	47	47	52	31	45				
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	25	31	33	28	35	28	22				
ELL	30	48	50	34	42	21	19				
BLK	46	55		29	40						
HSP	48	51	47	46	50	34	42				
MUL	80			50							
WHT	50	38	10	52	56		55				
FRL	47	49	40	45	50	37	43				
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	15	35	32	28	25	19	6				
ELL	38	41	29	34	49	39	23				
BLK	55	63		32	26		25				
HSP	51	54	35	47	56	35	36				
MUL	69			54							
WHT	62	52		62	65						
FRL	50	53	40	45	53	34	32				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	59
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	49
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.

Mathematics Learning Gains of the Low 25%: 29. This is a trend for the past two years. We have a significant number of students receiving Exceptional Student Education services in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade. We did not provide enough support for student learning and also didn't provide adequate support for teacher planning in mathematics.

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

5th grade ELA proficiency. 53% (2018) dropped to 41% (2019). We have a significant number of ELL students and students receiving Exceptional Student Education services and 5th grade. We did not provide enough support for student learning in these subcategories

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.

4th grade math proficiency. A difference of 24%. We have a significant number of ELL students and students receiving Exceptional Student Education services and 5th grade. We did not provide enough support for student learning and teacher planning in these sub-categories.

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

3rd grade ELA proficiency. 39% (2018) increased to 52% (2019). Increased teacher lesson planning with Reading Coach. Teachers integrating the standards into lesson planning.

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

Learning Gains in ELA and Mathematics and Bottom Quartile Learning gains in ELA and Mathematics

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

1. Increase gains in mathematics Bottom Quartile.
2. Increase gains in ELA Bottom Quartile
3. Increase gains in Students with Disabilities and African American subgroups.
4. Increase learning gains for all students.
5. Increase support for Co-teach (General Education and Exceptional Education classrooms)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will use data based decision making to drive instructional practices. This will be done through formative assessments within lessons. The rationale is based on the the following data: students in the ELA Bottom Quartile made 48% gains and the Students with Disabilities sub-group are under the 41% threshold. Students in the Math Bottom Quartile made 29% gains and all of the subgroups are under the 41% threshold.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the bottom quartile and targeted subgroups (Students With Disabilities and Black/African American) will make a 10% gain in proficiency and learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use formative assessments within their lessons to drive instructional practices and differentiate teaching strategies for students. Professional development will be provided to teachers based on current best practices and evidence-based strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Formative assessment is a planned process in which assessment-elicited evidence of students' status is used by teachers to adjust their ongoing instructional procedures or by students to adjust their current learning tactics. There are many research studies that support the use of Formative assessments to improve student achievement. Evidence based research can be found in the following article: Klute, M., Apthorp, H., Harlacher, J., & Reale, M. (2017). Formative assessment and elementary school student academic achievement: A review of the evidence (REL 2017–259). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide Professional Development on utilizing formative assessments during lessons and using the results to provide differentiated instruction

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Teachers will participate in planning sessions with academic coaches to develop effective formative assessments and to plan instructional strategies based on the data.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Leadership Team will analyze the students in the bottom quartile monthly to ensure that they are receiving additional support in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Patrick LaLone (patrick.lalone@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our school leadership team will continuously monitor all school wide improvement priorities through informal and formal observations with feedback; professional development and coaching; data analysis and review of individualized student interventions.

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.

Davis Elementary builds positive relations with parents through ongoing communication in both English and Spanish. We will hold several events throughout the year that provide support for parents with their child's learning and also to recognize their child's accomplishments. Davis Elementary actively pursues business partnerships within our community. After we have established partnerships within our community, we have our partners serve on our School Advisory Council and PTA. Our community partners also mentor students and provide incentives for students and staff.
We have a school-wide behavior program - PBIS. This program is infused throughout the school and enables students to be recognized and rewarded for positive school behavior and ensuring we have a supportive school culture.
We have a positive referral program "Deserving Dragons" where teachers recognize students for being a positive role model. The students are recognized in the office and their parents are called.
We have monthly "Student of the Month" breakfasts where a student from each classroom is selected for positively demonstrating the character trait of the month. Parents are invited to the breakfast.

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: Differentiation				$236,859.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0056 - Davis Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$88,920.00

			Notes: Hire Reading Coach - This person will provide coaching for all K-5 ELA teachers. They will also provide individual and small group reading support to students in K-5			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0056 - Davis Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$72,812.00
			Notes: Hire Math Resource Teacher - This person will provide coaching for all K-5 Math teachers. They will also provide individual and small group math support to students in K-5			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0056 - Davis Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$75,127.00
			Notes: Hire RTI Resource Teacher - This person will provide support to all teachers for behaviors, academic support, and attendance. They will also provide individual behavior support to approximately 30 students.			
					Total:	**$236,859.00**