Dickenson Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dickenson Elementary School

4720 KELLY RD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brody Marisa   Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Dickenson Elementary School

4720 KELLY RD, 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	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

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

To promote and develop a mindset that everyone can learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering and preparing lifelong learners for a positive and successful future.

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
Brody, Marisa	Principal	Members of this committee oversee and plan for school improvement. They are a liaison with their teams to communicate needs of students and teachers for training and support. This team also looks at the big picture of school growth and ways to support learning of teachers and students.
Sanney, Kristin	SAC Member	
Brooks, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Fogarty, Laura	Instructional Coach	
Grubka, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Mondragon, Maybelly	Other	
Kuylik, Lisette	Teacher, ESE	
Miller, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, Brody Marisa

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	79	82	95	106	103	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	570
Attendance below 90 percent	14	20	20	25	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	86	87	117	111	92	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	21	24	30	18	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	0	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	86	87	117	111	92	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	21	24	30	18	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	0	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	52%	52%	57%	56%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	54%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	56%	51%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	72%	54%	63%	75%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	57%	62%	63%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	46%	51%	48%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	50%	53%	52%	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	46%	52%	-6%	58%	-12%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%
	2018	72%	55%	17%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	57%	10%	64%	3%
	2018	67%	57%	10%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
	2018	73%	54%	19%	61%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	51%	-12%	53%	-14%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	17	37	33	28	47	50					
ELL	44	48	55	68	68	65	28				
BLK	57	53		67	76		42				
HSP	52	55	55	74	70	58	44				
WHT	38			54							
FRL	51	53	47	70	68	56	41				
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	15	29	20	27	57	55					
ELL	46	49	57	67	63	57	30				
BLK	41	38		62	73						
HSP	55	56	64	76	73	66	56				
MUL	60			80							
WHT	62	53		73	59		65				
FRL	53	55	59	73	71	66	56				
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	18	33	55	54	52						
ELL	44	44	42	78	69	50	40				
BLK	33	50		54	36						
HSP	59	55	63	79	68	59	56				
MUL	50			69							
WHT	57	56		73	47						
FRL	55	54	59	75	61	49	48				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	59
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	61
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	
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	46
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	58
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.

The lowest performance overall school wide ranges from Science, Reading, then Math. Contributing factors for science would be the the overall reading performance being near 50% proficient. Science requires reasoning skills when breaking down questions, vocabulary development, and/or exposure to more rigorous nonfiction text. Trends seen were an overall drop across all grade levels in overall reading proficiency, while in math this only happened in 3rd and 5th.

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

Science had the greatest decline of 11% (54% in 2018 to 43% in 2019). This decline was due to less emphasis placed on academic reading in science and a lack of reading growth that year. Students and teachers lacked reading support; change in reading question types; and fluctuation of student enrollment. Another area of concern was the lowest 25th percentile in math- there was tremendous growth the year before (2018) and proved difficult to replicate. New instructional calendar and leadership could have been factors.

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.

Science due to lack of following instructional timelines, reasoning skills when breaking down questions, vocabulary development, or exposure to rigorous nonfiction text.

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

No area showed improvement, but we are able the state by 10% in math (2019). We have continued to utilize our math resource, small group learning, planning sessions, Monthly assessments, and teacher knowledge of best practices.

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

N/A

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

1. ELA
2. Science
3. Bottom Quartile
4. Attendance
5. Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is instructional reading practice so that teachers have a clear expectation for reading instruction and specifically small groups. This impacts students learning because our instructional practices should be driven by data based decisions and those instructional practices need to increase student performance. This need is critical because it affects all other areas of learning. We were 5% lower than the state but equal with the district in 2019 for total ELA proficiency. However, we were as much as 14% lower in certain grade levels than like schools near us.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency by 5% in each reading and learning gains for each grade level..
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marisa Brody (marisa.brody@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using SIPPS, LAFS, i-ready and achieve 3000 while planning and creating a clear expectations for reading instruction whole group and small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are implementing this area of focus to make sure our data based decision are being used to drive instruction by creating instructional practices that increase students learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ELA professional development- Surveys of teacher needs, observations gathered to determine need and new information will determine PD given. This will be done in coaching sessions, planning, or groups - faculty meetings, and /or Teach Me Tuesdays (N. Valdez)

Person Responsible	Marisa Brody (marisa.brody@hcps.net)

2. As needed DATA Chats (subs needed for meetings); One-on-One coaching; Academic Reviews; Modeling lessons; Bottom quartile support; Collaborative Planning (Brainpop, nearpod, Reading AtoZ are resources that might be utllized); (N.Valdez)

Person Responsible	Marisa Brody (marisa.brody@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Science- Professional development; data chats (Subs needed for meetings), Modeling Lessons, Collaborative planning, Stem implementation ; Student engagement and vocabulary instruction with Flocabulary, Nearpod, and brainpop.
Math- Math professional development- data chats (subs needed for meetings); one-on-one coaching; Teach Me Tuesday; Site Visits; Academic reviews; Modeling lessons; Bottom quartile supports; Collaborative Planning - using Teacher i-ready tookit. (L. Fogarty).

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.

Our school Guidance Counselor is providing character education within the classroom and digitally for eLearners.
We are in year 2 of implementing PBIS. This program helps to create a positive culture both at school and at home with regards to learning academics and behavior. For both Brick and Mortar and eLearning we are using this system to create awards and incentives for behavior and growth mindset.
We will communicate and build a positive culture by providing opportunities for our families to interact and communicate through blackboard, parent meetings, STEM nights, ELL liaison parent meetings, Conference nights, having an active PTA, Great American Teach-In, and Veterans Day program. The school is working with the community partnerships and parents to help support and build relationships. There are weekend Food bags provided by local churches for our low SES families. Also the School Social Worker is actively finding sources of funding for needs within our school as well as SEL and the Second Step Program..

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00