

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Doby Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Doby Elementary School

6720 COVINGTON GARDEN DR, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Fuller

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	57%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Doby Elementary School

6720 COVINGTON GARDEN DR, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">45%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">48%</p>

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.

Inez Doby Elementary will provide meaningful learning opportunities allowing students to reach their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inez Doby Elementary is a place where students, faculty, and staff exemplify excellence in character and academics.

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
------	-------	---------------------------------

Leadership team meetings can include the following:

- Principal - Rosanne Rush
- Assistant Principal - Camie Hong (ELP Coordinator, ELL Chairperson, Testing Coordinator)
- Guidance Counselor - Sarah Guggenmos, Nancy Burke
- SAC Chair - Tara Raquepau
- School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative - Kimberly Gonzalez
- School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative - Stephanie McDonnell
- Reading Resource Teacher - Sabrina Hoops
- ESE Specialist - Joanie Wilson
- PLC Liaisons for each grade level
- District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches)

The Instructional Leadership Team meets regularly (2x/month). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:

1. Collaborate and problem solve the fidelity of high quality instructional practices
2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
4. Support the implementation of small group instruction and differentiated instruction.
5. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

Rush,
Rosanne Principal

A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Instructional Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader.

Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.

HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

demonstrates the impact of a principal’s leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district’s vision of instructional improvement.

Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development.

Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact. Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers’ transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Bradley Fuller

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

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)	57%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	92	111	118	110	104	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	639
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	13	13	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	22	72	35	45	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
Course failure in Math	1	5	19	20	17	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
	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	2	6	3	4	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	126	145	135	133	135	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	796
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	20	18	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	11	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	4	5	9	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	126	145	135	133	135	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	796
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	20	18	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	11	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	4	5	9	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	52%	57%	64%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	58%	61%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	50%	53%	50%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	63%	59%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	62%	55%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	46%	51%	46%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	50%	53%	54%	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	70%	52%	18%	58%	12%
	2018	70%	53%	17%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
	2018	68%	55%	13%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	57%	7%	64%	0%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	60%	-22%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	51%	-2%	53%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	52%	9%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	26	23	15	26	44	44	19				
ELL	47	46	18	42	36	40	23				
BLK	56	48	50	42	32		43				
HSP	55	47	21	46	44	29	34				
MUL	52	50		47	50		67				
WHT	69	53	26	64	63	63	59				
FRL	55	49	28	42	46	33	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	30	34	37	33	58	67	25				
ELL	58	39	18	67	70						
ASN	70			100							
BLK	54	45	33	46	55	64	33				
HSP	52	43	32	55	57	52	56				
MUL	79	53		64	58						
WHT	72	58	67	72	67	58	72				
FRL	57	46	33	50	54	52	55				
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	26	46	38	26	26	20	19				
ELL	40	63	55	49	46	38	20				
ASN	93	70		100	75						
BLK	50	69	69	54	65	57	54				
HSP	51	58	47	49	41	36	44				
MUL	75	64		50	55						
WHT	73	58	38	64	58	56	57				
FRL	56	61	50	48	49	49	47				

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	53
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	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	42
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	45
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	44

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	53
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	57
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	47
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 bottom quartile for ELA showed the lowest performance, with only 30% of all 3rd-5th graders demonstrating proficiency on the 2019 FSA. In our SWD subgroup, only 15% of students made gains. This has become a trend at Doby.

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

The bottom quartile for Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Data from FSA Math 2018 and 2019 show that there was an 18% decline, from 57% to 39%. Our teachers are more effective in teaching core instruction than differentiating for the needs of diverse learners.

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.

The bottom quartile for Math had the greatest gap compared to the state average, with a difference of 23%. A more efficient daily schedule and ESE support schedule is needed to provide our students with additional small group instruction. Additionally, differentiated instruction and small group needs to be more consistent and targeted.

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

All components showed a decrease based upon the FSA 2019 data. This year, more consistent usage of I-Ready was implemented, along with incentives for student achievement.

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

Based upon the EWS data, Reading proficiency across the grade levels is an area of concern. Additionally, our students in 5th grade have a high number of Level 1's in both Math & Reading based on the FSA 2019 data.

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

1. Performance of SWD on statewide assessments in ELA & Math.
2. Performance of students scoring in the bottom quartile on statewide assessments in ELA & Math
3. Learning gains for all 4th & 5th grade students in ELA & Math
4. Providing differentiated instruction for all students across the content areas.
5. Performance of all 5th graders in Science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will design, use, and analyze assessments that target specific standards in order to evaluate lesson effectiveness and plan for future instruction. Based upon the 2019 FSA Math & ELA data, our students scored below the state and district average for Learning Gains; comparing 2018 to 2019 data, our students declined in all content areas, with a 20% decrease in ELA and a 12% decrease in Science.

Measurable Outcome: *Our SWD students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency in all content areas on statewide assessments.
 *All retained Third Graders, and all Fourth and Fifth graders will demonstrate an increase in proficiency and make learning gains in all content areas on statewide assessments.
 *All Fourth and Fifth grade students falling in the bottom quartile will demonstrate an increase in proficiency in all content areas on statewide assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: *All departmentalized teachers will regularly plan with their teaching partner to help incorporate evidence based teaching strategies in order to align instruction across the content areas.
 *Teachers will engage in data chats and PLC's on a regular basis to analyze student data and plan to use that data to drive their instruction forward.
 *Grade level content specific teachers will engage in collaborative and intentional planning on a weekly basis in order to meet the needs of all learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Doby's decline in proficiency across the content areas in all grade levels, as well as the proficiency of SWD indicate a strong need for higher quality and rigorous instruction to occur.

Action Steps to Implement

- *Targeted PD for instructional strategies for teaching SWD - Joanie Wilson, ESE Specialist
- *Provide an overview of the BrainSpring resources - District Staff
- *Monthly data chats within PLC's, facilitated by a designated grade level representative
- *Weekly walkthroughs by administration, with immediate feedback - Principal & Assistant Principal

Person Responsible: Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

We will utilize small group instruction and appropriate technology resources to meet individual student needs in order to close the learning gaps. Based upon our 2019 FSA data, as well as I-Ready diagnostics, it is evident that there is a huge learning gap among subgroups. More specifically, our SWD data shows that 26% of 3rd-5th graders are proficient in Reading, and 15% of the bottom quartile have made gains. Additionally, our SWD data on the Science FSSA shows that only 19% achieved proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

- *All SWD will demonstrate an increase in proficiency on statewide assessments across all content areas.
- *All students in fourth and fifth grade falling in the bottom quartile will demonstrate learning gains in ELA and Math on statewide assessments.
- *All Fourth and Fifth graders will demonstrate an increase in proficiency and make learning gains in ELA and Math on statewide assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- *Lesson plans will reflect differentiated instruction based on the needs of the students.
- *Small group instruction in Math and Reading will occur daily based on the needs of individual students.
- *Teachers will collaborate with the ESE teachers weekly to plan differentiated lessons aligned with state standards.
- *Teachers will participate in monthly data chats focused on specific data.
- *Teachers will attend monthly PD targeting on small group instruction in Math and Reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The most effective learning takes place in classrooms where rigorous and engaging instruction is occurring. Progress monitoring is ongoing and takes place daily. Differentiated tasks and small group instruction is pivotal in increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

- *Teachers will incorporate district approved technology to support struggling learners
- *Utilize district support staff to facilitate planning sessions, PD, and PLC's
- *Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure that small group instruction and differentiated tasks are present in every classroom.
- *Coaching/support will be provided by Reading Resource teacher
- *Teacher leaders will facilitate informal professional development to their colleagues

Person Responsible

Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our ILT meets on a monthly basis to analyze and discuss data. We will be focusing on a specific content area each month and brainstorm ways to increase student achievement. Possible learning walks and/or ghost walks will determine the fidelity of small group instruction in every classroom.

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.

Last year, Doby implemented the use of Restorative Practices in order to merge academic, social, and emotional learning. Research show that a responsive classroom approach makes the academic environment more engaging, improves classroom management, and creates a climate and classroom community in which students feel safe to take the risks necessary for learning.

This year, we will continue to implement Restorative Practices strategies, and build upon the practices already in place. We will hold daily morning meetings in every classroom, encourage positive behavior through use of our "Doby Dollars", and provide students with incentives to be kind, caring, and respectful to all stakeholders.

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: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00