

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Ippolito 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

Ippolito Elementary School

6874 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Eleise Medina

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: C (41%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

Ippolito Elementary School

6874 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[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 | 87% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 87% |

School Grades History

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

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.

Mission Statement

All stakeholders will contribute to the academic success of all children while supporting their social-emotional development, thus preparing them as positive contributors to America's future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Vision Statement

Student performance will exceed state averages through innovative, data-driven instruction grounded in best practices.

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 |
|-------------------|-----------|---|
| McManamey, Ashlee | Principal | Oversee the functions of the school site. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Eleise Medina

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

36

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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: C (41%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| 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 | 76 | 72 | 82 | 59 | 99 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| | 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 | 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 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 22 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 20 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 40 | 46 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |

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 | 9 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |

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 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 22 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 20 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 40 | 46 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |

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 | 9 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |

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 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 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 | 38% | 52% | 57% | 37% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 45% | 55% | 58% | 47% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 38% | 50% | 53% | 39% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 44% | 54% | 63% | 39% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 54% | 57% | 62% | 34% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 46% | 51% | 29% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 41% | 50% | 53% | 22% | 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 | 33% | 52% | -19% | 58% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 43% | 53% | -10% | 57% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 28% | 55% | -27% | 58% | -30% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 55% | -16% | 56% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 37% | 54% | -17% | 56% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 51% | -17% | 55% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 29% | 54% | -25% | 62% | -33% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 55% | -19% | 62% | -26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 32% | 57% | -25% | 64% | -32% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 57% | -6% | 62% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -19% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 56% | 54% | 2% | 60% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 32% | 54% | -22% | 61% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 24% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 41% | 51% | -10% | 53% | -12% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 23% | 52% | -29% | 55% | -32% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| 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 | 28 | 34 | 27 | 35 | 43 | 45 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 46 | | 39 | 62 | | 36 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 38 | 33 | 40 | 47 | 46 | 24 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 44 | 30 | 48 | 58 | 45 | 58 | | | | |
| MUL | 62 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 53 | | 44 | 73 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 45 | 38 | 40 | 51 | 47 | 35 | | | | |
| 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 | 33 | 32 | 25 | 40 | 49 | 35 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 46 | | 37 | 57 | 75 | 15 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 46 | 44 | 39 | 55 | 43 | 14 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 51 | | 47 | 63 | 60 | 32 | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 67 | | 53 | 72 | | 44 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 50 | 49 | 43 | 60 | 51 | 24 | | | | |
| 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 | 5 | 29 | 29 | 11 | 17 | 14 | | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 18 | | 33 | 47 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 50 | 40 | 36 | 26 | 24 | 23 | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 38 | 40 | 38 | 41 | 33 | 11 | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 82 | | 60 | 70 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 38 | | 42 | 24 | | 31 | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 46 | 38 | 36 | 32 | 28 | 20 | | | | |

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 | 46 |
| 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 | 55 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 364 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 37 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 54 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 56 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 43 |
| 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 Achievement Down 6% Lowest Area-38% of Students Proficient

- PLCs were not designed for content-level planning around the standards.
- Common assessments were not utilized to drive instructional shifts.
- Content knowledge was not routinely enhanced during PD

ELA Learning Gains 3rd-5th Down 7%

- PLCs were not designed for content-level planning around the standards.
- Common assessments were not utilized to drive instructional shifts.
- Content knowledge was not routinely enhanced during PD
- Rtl was not done with fidelity

Math Learning Gains 3-5 Down 6%

- PLCs were not designed for content-level planning around the standards.
- Content knowledge was not routinely enhance during PD

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

ELA Bottom Quartile Down 10%

- Teacher survey data indicated the following;
- Teachers were inconsistent with their views and practices in RtI
- PLCs did not have a common mission or central focus when discussing the progress of students identified in the BQ
- The perceptions of using data-analysis to drive instruction did not seem useful for many staff members

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.

Math Achievement-18% Gap Between School and State Performance

- The school dismissed 15 minutes early everyday which resulted in less instructional time
- Content/grade level planning was not consistent
- PD was not routine in building teachers' knowledge of instructional practices

ELA Achievement-18% Gap Between School and State Performance

- The school dismissed 15 minutes early everyday which resulted in less instructional time
- Content/grade level planning was not consistent
- PD was not routine in building teachers' knowledge of instructional practices
- Common assessments were not utilized

When breaking down the data further by grade level, the following two areas show the greatest gap between school and state level score.

- 4th grade ELA: 30% Below State Average
- 5th grade Math: 33% Below State Average

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

Science 5th increased by 16%

- Science coach conducted frequent lunch-bunches where prior standards were reviewed
- PLCs were frequent
- A spiral review of prior standards not taught in 5th grade were routinely reviewed
- Tutoring after school was utilized to enhance science instruction
- All 5th grade students used science journals. Everyday students posted an Essential Question in their notebook and responded

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

Second Grade Attendance-21 Students have an attendance rate below 90%.

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

1. Students' learning tasks are aligned to learning targets
2. Assessment is used to intentionally plan for differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | *ELA Achievement/Learning Gains and Math Learning Gains will Increase* |
|---|--|

Measurable Outcome:

| | |
|---|--|
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Ashlee McManamey (ashlee.mcmanamey@hcps.net) |
|---|--|

Evidence-based Strategy:**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The African American subgroup scored 37% on the ESSA on Federal Index. This subgroup falls far behind the 41% threshold set for subgroups in critical need of support. |
|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Measurable Outcome: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC Assessment Protocols will include an ESSA student breakdown of test results. The PLC will monitor the progress of African American students monthly, and will problem-solve around next steps for instruction. -iReady, Achieve, and Monthly Math and ELA Unit Assessments will be used to monitor growth |
|----------------------------|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Ashlee McManamey (ashlee.mcmanamey@hcps.net) |
|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students in the African American subgroup will be in iReady and/or Achieve instruction for both reading and math for 45 minutes a week -Students in African American subgroup will be invited to ELP. Reading ELP strategies will center around using informational texts using the reciprocal teaching model. For math, students will work on fact fluency. |
|---------------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -iReady and Achieve are research-based programs used increasing student achievement -Reciprocal teaching is a proven strategy to improve the meta-cognitive functions during reading -A lack of fact fluency is delaying students' progress in learning more complex skills. |
|---|--|

Action Steps to Implement*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The SWD subgroup scored 35% on the ESSA on Federal Index. This subgroup falls far behind the 41% threshold set for subgroups in critical need of support. |
| Measurable Outcome: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC Assessment Protocols will include an ESSA student breakdown of test results. The PLC will monitor the progress of SWD monthly, and will problem-solve around next steps for instruction. -IReady, Achieve, and Monthly Math and ELA Unit Assessments will be used to monitor growth -ESE specialists will bring students' test scores to each leadership meeting to review progress and determine next steps for classroom supports |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Ashlee McManamey (ashlee.mcmanamey@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students in the SWD subgroup will be in iReady and/or Achieve instruction for both reading and math for 45 minutes a week -The SWD subgroup will be invited to ELP. Reading ELP strategies will center around using informational texts using the reciprocal teaching model. For math, students will work on fact fluency. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -IReady and Achieve are research-based programs used increasing student achievement -Reciprocal teaching is a proven strategy to improve the meta-cognitive functions during reading -A lack of fact fluency is delaying students' progress in learning more complex skills. |

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

ELA Achievement/Learning Gains and Math Learning Gains will Increase

- 1) Grade Level/Content Level PLCs will be scheduled to meet bi-weekly for 3 differing purposes;**
- 1) Follow a standards-planning protocol for upcoming instruction, 2) Follow a common-assessment protocol to intentionally plan for next steps in instruction, and 3) RTI: Review students' response to instruction**
- 2) School leadership will work with district staff in identify/designing common assessments that will be given after each anchor standard. PLCs are scheduled for teachers to use a common assessment protocol to identify trends and shifts in instruction.**
- 3) Monthly PD will be conducted by site-based resource teachers. The purpose of the PD is to build teachers' knowledge around their content area**
- 4) Clear expectations around Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 supports will be provided for all staff.**
- 5) Fidelity walkthroughs will be conducted monthly. Each Rtl provider will receive feedback on instruction**
- 6) The ILTs purpose will be clearly defined. The ILT's function will be to drive the school's look-for around the instructional priorities**
- 7) Targeted walkthroughs will be conducted by the administration and the leadership team to provide frequent feedback on the school's two instructional priorities (See 1 & 2)**
- 8) Quarterly academic reviews will be conducted to monitor students' progress**

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.

Ippolito Elementary strives every day to build, maintain, and grow positive relationships with students, families, and our community. We value these relationships and know that our students will flourish with a mutual partnership that shares a common goal: Prepare Students for Life. There are several in which we involve all of our stakeholders.

- Weekly parent updates via mass email and text alerts
- Monthly PTA meetings
- Monthly SAC meetings
- Monthly newsletters
- Social media engagement via Twitter & Facebook
- Parent informational sessions via Zoom separated by cohorts/grade-levels
- School-wide communication system using the app Dojo
- Student progress is frequently discussed with parents via student-led and teacher-led conferences
- Student services have frequent sessions with parents and students in an effort to provided individualized

support around social and emotional growth

-The Ron Clark House System was adopted. The purpose of the house system is to create a strong sense of community and a positive school culture

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 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |