

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mendenhall 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 | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Mendenhall Elementary School

5202 N MENDENHALL DR, Tampa, FL 33603

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Skylaar Guyer

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 | 16 |

Mendenhall Elementary School

5202 N MENDENHALL DR, Tampa, FL 33603

[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 | 90% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 88% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide differentiated instruction that meets all students' academic and social needs as we prepare them for graduation and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Fernandez, Cristina | Principal | |
| Bates, Nicole | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Skylaar Guyer

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.*

2

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

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: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| 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 | 69 | 69 | 71 | 85 | 81 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 457 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 13 | 8 | 15 | 10 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 | |
| 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 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |

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 | 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 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 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 | 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 | 60 | 89 | 67 | 79 | 69 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 438 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 14 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

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 | 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 | 50% | 52% | 57% | 48% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | 55% | 58% | 55% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 72% | 50% | 53% | 52% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 55% | 54% | 63% | 48% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 68% | 57% | 62% | 59% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 62% | 46% | 51% | 51% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 35% | 50% | 53% | 39% | 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 | 49% | 52% | -3% | 58% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 53% | -11% | 57% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 46% | 55% | -9% | 58% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 55% | -18% | 56% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 42% | 54% | -12% | 56% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 43% | 51% | -8% | 55% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 55% | 54% | 1% | 62% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 55% | -16% | 62% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 60% | 57% | 3% | 64% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 57% | -12% | 62% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 21% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 36% | 54% | -18% | 60% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 61% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 30% | 51% | -21% | 53% | -23% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 52% | -13% | 55% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 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 | 29 | 52 | 75 | 30 | 50 | 53 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 54 | 65 | 49 | 63 | 71 | 30 | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 64 | | 42 | 79 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 59 | 72 | 55 | 65 | 69 | 37 | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 50 | | 56 | 64 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 60 | 74 | 53 | 68 | 62 | 34 | | | | |
| 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 | 19 | 28 | 39 | 23 | 46 | 35 | | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 43 | 48 | 35 | 57 | 57 | 30 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 44 | 45 | 41 | 60 | | 50 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 53 | 53 | 48 | 63 | 53 | 42 | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 43 | | 59 | 67 | | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 50 | 51 | 48 | 64 | 49 | 41 | | | | |
| 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 | 16 | 53 | 48 | 24 | 39 | 29 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 49 | 45 | 33 | 52 | 50 | 20 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 55 | | 25 | 53 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 54 | 50 | 48 | 60 | 51 | 36 | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 65 | | 64 | 52 | | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 55 | 54 | 47 | 60 | 52 | 36 | | | | |

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 | 58 |
| 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 | 63 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 464 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 45 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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.

Without any formal statewide assessments during the 2019-2020 school year, and considering our 5th graders low performance on the district mid-year science assessment, science remains our lowest performance area. Emphasis has been placed on ELA and math because of student performance in the primary grades. Not enough emphasis was placed on science in the primary grades and this has caused a snowball effect on our student understanding of the subject.

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

Our science scores dropped 7% last year on statewide testing and this was the only component that our scores dropped. Not enough focus was placed on planning and instruction.

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.

There is an 18% gap between our science achievement and the state average. More focus was placed on the planning and instruction of ELA and math, which saw significant gains, and not enough focus was placed on science.

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

ELA Bottom Quartile gains saw the most improvement. ELA collaboratively planned weekly with a resource teacher, training and coaching cycles focused on the writing component of the assessment and students were pulled 3 times weekly in extra small group instruction.

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

Attendance improved during the 2019-2020 school year, but due to the unusual nature of the 4th quarter, attendance will remain a focus moving into the 2020-2021 school year.

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

1. Standards-based instruction in all subject areas
2. Attendance
3. Students with disabilities
4. ELL
5. Content Specific Areas

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | 59% of students made learning gains in ELA. 68% of students made learning gains in mathematics. 35% of students reached proficiency in Science, learning gains are not calculated for science. We believe that all students can show one years growth in one years time and would like to continue our focus towards the progress of that goal. |
| Measurable Outcome: | By May 29, 2021, 70% of students will show learning gains in all subjects. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Cristina Fernandez (cristina.fernandez@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Instructional coaches will guide grade level planning sessions, conduct inhouse professional development, conduct coaching cycles with teachers and work with students with specific targeted instruction.</p> <p>Standards-based collaborative planning with resource teachers on a weekly basis.</p> <p>Grade levels will be provided with a separate PLC time weekly to monitor student progress of standards-based instruction. Regular and relevant data analysis will occur during weekly PLC's.</p> <p>Timely and relevant professional development will be conducted at the school level and on an individual basis based on teacher and student needs. Teachers will be engaged in focused learning walks based on specific needs identified through data analysis and walkthroughs.</p> <p>Technology will be incorporated into lessons on a daily basis. Office 365, Padlet, Brain Pop, Ellevation, Nearpod and Myon will be woven into collaborative planning and coaching cycles.</p> <p>A demo classroom will be available for teachers to visit on a daily basis</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>The practice of aligning learning to standards helps ensure that a higher level of learning is attained, guides teachers in the process of assessment and helps keep them on track.</p> <p>Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Studies have shown that in-house professional development is more targeted to the specific needs of a school faculty. In-house professional development allows training to occur in planning, during and after a lesson, as well as during after school more general training's.</p> |

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.

Attendance will be prioritized throughout the year. The school's social worker will provide weekly incentives to students on individual attendance plans. Classrooms with perfect attendance will be announced on the morning show daily. Monthly classroom attendance winners will be announced and celebrated with an "attenDANCE" to encourage regular attendance by all students.

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.

Building a positive school culture and environment is important and for both staff and students. We help build a positive school culture and environment in the following way:

McDonald's Lunch for students demonstrating good character and behavior
 Character Awards Monthly
 Positive behavior awards (Pawsitive Behavior)
 Growth mindset
 Patrols
 Faculty Thank Yous
 Business partners help celebrate student and staff (Dunkin, Wawa, 18 Bagels, Village Inn, Jason's Deli)
 Tiger Buck Store
 Fun Fair/VIP Party
 Monthly behavior celebrations
 Faculty appreciation weeks
 Social Committee
 Actively participate in programs such as, Math Bowl, Tropicana Speech, and essay contests
 Hispanic Heritage Celebrations
 Monthly family nights

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|--|----------------|-----|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | | | | \$0.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 100-Salaries | 2961 - Mendenhall Elementary School | | 2.0 | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: An ELA Resource Teacher will enhance student learning and build teacher practice.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 510-Supplies | 2961 - Mendenhall Elementary School | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Professional Development will enhance student learning by building teachers' ability to provide high quality instruction focused specifically on our Instructional Priorities.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 2961 - Mendenhall Elementary School | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Professional development will occur onsite to provide timely and relevant instructional support and feedback. Substitute teachers will cover classrooms when teachers attend focused learning walks and visit our demo classrooms.</i> | | | |
| | 7800 | | 2961 - Mendenhall Elementary School | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Transportation to and from instructional field trips will enhance student understanding of the diverse topics they learn about in the classroom and let them experience these topics in a real-world setting.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 730-Dues and Fees | 2961 - Mendenhall Elementary School | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Covering the admission fees for instructional field trips will allow our students to experience instructional activities they may not otherwise have the opportunity to experience due to financial hardship.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 519-Technology-Related Supplies | 2961 - Mendenhall Elementary School | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Technology supplies such as bulbs for elmo projectors, computer ink, poster maker paper and poster maker blades will help our teachers bring technology into each classroom and lesson to enhance student learning.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 100-Salaries | 2961 - Mendenhall Elementary School | | 1.0 | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: A Math Resource Teacher will enhance student learning and build teacher practice.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | | 2961 - Mendenhall Elementary School | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Certificates to honor students during Character Awards, honor roll, I met my Goal Award, Attendance, PAW Award, Citizenship, Reading, Math, Science.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$0.00 |