Deer Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deer Park Elementary School

11605 CITRUS PARK DR, Tampa, FL 33626

www.deerpark.mysdhc.org

Demographics

Principal: Edith Lefler

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (68%)
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

Deer Park Elementary School

11605 CITRUS PARK DR, Tampa, FL 33626

www.deerpark.mysdhc.org

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	No	24%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	**2019-20**	**2018-19**	**2017-18**	**2016-17**
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

Deer Park will maximize student potential and provide them with the knowledge, skills, and character necessary for success in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Deer Park will be the top performing school in Hillsborough County.

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
Lefler, Edith	Principal	Ensure the safety of all students and staff. Creating a positive school culture. Creating a long-term plan for student academic success. Cultivating leadership in others. Managing people, data, and processes. Improving School Leadership.
Findley, Eric	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Edith Lefler

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.*
13

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (68%)
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	122	162	146	134	152	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	6	8	2	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	14	17	19	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
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	172	172	146	158	113	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	11	8	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	172	172	146	158	113	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	11	8	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	82%	52%	57%	73%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	55%	58%	65%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	57%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	54%	63%	74%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	57%	62%	64%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	46%	51%	51%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	50%	53%	69%	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	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%	
	2018	78%	53%	25%	57%	21%	
Same Grade Comparison		6%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	79%	55%	24%	58%	21%	
	2018	74%	55%	19%	56%	18%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
05	2019	83%	54%	29%	56%	27%	
	2018	71%	51%	20%	55%	16%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		9%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	83%	54%	29%	62%	21%	
	2018	79%	55%	24%	62%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	86%	57%	29%	64%	22%	
	2018	76%	57%	19%	62%	14%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
Cohort Comparison		7%					
05	2019	75%	54%	21%	60%	15%	
	2018	76%	54%	22%	61%	15%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	74%	52%	22%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	25	29	16	30	44	45	20				
ELL	69	70	65	72	64	53	73				
ASN	92	75	73	93	83		93				
BLK	71	57		67	57		70				
HSP	71	66	57	66	71	61	68				
MUL	75	69		80	69						
WHT	85	71	59	84	76	52	83				
FRL	73	68	57	67	70	59	65				
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	22	46	50	27	42	29	36				
ELL	59	69	71	65	77	69	64				
ASN	90	81	70	93	84		87				
BLK	65	75		43	56						
HSP	68	54	48	67	74	63	74				
MUL	74	50		78							
WHT	77	62	57	81	77	52	73				
FRL	61	46	47	60	70	55	58				
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	38	54	55	41	50	53	64				
ELL	44	59	53	50	71	50	50				
ASN	82	72		90	84		77				
BLK	64	67		52	57		55				
HSP	61	59	55	62	56	42	61				
MUL	71			82							
WHT	77	66	55	77	63	51	74				
FRL	59	60	56	59	58	41	68				

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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	578
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	67
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	84
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	64
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	65

Hispanic Students	
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	73
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	73
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	65
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.

ELA Learning gains 70% Bottom Quartile 61%
Math Learning gains 75% Bottom Quartile 58%
This was actually an improvement over previous years.

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

SWD which makes up some of our bottom quartile was at 30% for ESSA We would like to be at least 41%. Providing consistent target intervention is important to this group. We have continued to improve ESE schedules to maximize time with students.

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 were above the state average in all categories

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

ELA Proficiency for 2019 was 82% compared to the previous 77%. Targeted data-informed instruction.

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

Progress of our SWD
Math Gains

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

1. 1. Gains for our SWD
2. Math Bottom Quartile gains
3. ELA Bottom Quartile gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement will increase when focusing on a positive inclusive environment Rationale: Cultivating positive classroom environment that emphasizes kindness provides opportunities for students the opportunity to goal set.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2019-20 Student SCIP survey results that showed 52% of students agreed with the statement: Students at this school treat others with respect. Our goal is to raise this percentage to 60%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborating for student success and positive classroom environment
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborating among teachers allows for positive interactions, team discussions, content differentiation, strategies for different learners and positive classroom environment.

Action Steps to Implement

Faculty lead TLCs to implement strategies such as class meetings to promote a positive classroom environment that is inclusive.

Person Responsible Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)

Administration walkthroughs and follow ups

Person Responsible Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student gain scores will increase in ELA and math by teachers implementing differentiated instruction to consistently meet the needs of all learners including our SWD. Rationale : Providing teachers with strategies and opportunities to enhance student learning by differentiating for all students will increase gains in the bottom quartile students and SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	Math learning gains from the bottom quartile will increase from 58% to 61%. ELA scores for SWD will increase from 25% Proficient 29% making gains to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboration among teachers and effective TLCS along with planning and delivering differentiated instruction and small group instruction will increase ELA and math gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Content differentiating and small group creation will be offered in TLCs Admin walkthroughs will help with providing strategies for different learners

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher led trainings

Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)

Administration walkthroughs

Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Improvement in technology is also a focus to better meet the needs of all learners.

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.

Deer Park will have a positive inclusive culture continuing to grow with our focus on Kindness. Kindness is an emphasis of our school managing and motivating plan. Our school will work on practicing Kindness and embracing diversity.

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: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**