

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Seffner 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 | 17 |

Seffner Elementary School

109 CACTUS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Renel Mathurin

Start Date for this Principal: 1/8/2016

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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 (41%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (40%) |
| 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Seffner Elementary School

109 CACTUS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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 | 75% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 58% |

School Grades History

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

We will equip, empower and enrich our future leaders - E3

Provide the school's vision statement.

Seffner Elementary will become the district's front-runner in developing problem solvers ready for tomorrow's challenges.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Hermann, Shelly | Principal | Principal of school |
| Atherton, Jessica | Teacher, K-12 | Teacher Leader |
| Whitehead, Amy | Teacher, ESE | Teacher Leader |
| Claffie, Kristine | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of School |
| Mounce, Sara | Instructional Media | Teacher Leader |
| | | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 1/8/2016, Renel Mathurin

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (40%) |
| 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 | 58 | 65 | 55 | 68 | 62 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 381 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| 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 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 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 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 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 | 11 | 41 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 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 | 11 | 41 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 45% | 52% | 57% | 46% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 47% | 55% | 58% | 48% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 50% | 53% | 45% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 43% | 54% | 63% | 47% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 43% | 57% | 62% | 48% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 18% | 46% | 51% | 31% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 46% | 50% | 53% | 26% | 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 | 41% | 52% | -11% | 58% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 53% | 0% | 57% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 46% | 55% | -9% | 58% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 55% | -4% | 56% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 45% | 54% | -9% | 56% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 51% | -15% | 55% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 34% | 54% | -20% | 62% | -28% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 55% | -3% | 62% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 45% | 57% | -12% | 64% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 57% | 6% | 62% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 52% | 54% | -2% | 60% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 54% | -20% | 61% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 53% | -6% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 36% | 52% | -16% | 55% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| 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 | 24 | 39 | 33 | 27 | 33 | 19 | 26 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 36 | | 24 | 57 | 45 | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 33 | | 33 | 38 | | 43 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 47 | 47 | 33 | 43 | 32 | 35 | | | | |
| MUL | 31 | | | 31 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 53 | 50 | 55 | 45 | | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 46 | 46 | 35 | 35 | 23 | 40 | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 33 | 22 | 37 | 49 | 29 | 23 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 17 | | 26 | 36 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 31 | | 36 | 39 | 30 | 20 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 43 | 30 | 51 | 52 | 33 | 28 | | | | |
| MUL | 53 | | | 53 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 42 | 29 | 55 | 57 | 44 | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 42 | 29 | 46 | 50 | 38 | 34 | | | | |
| 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 | 9 | 42 | 50 | 24 | 44 | 44 | 5 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 52 | | 28 | 42 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 39 | 36 | 33 | 45 | 43 | 27 | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 54 | 56 | 44 | 49 | 29 | 13 | | | | |
| MUL | 60 | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 47 | 35 | 51 | 48 | 25 | 33 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 44 | 39 | 40 | 45 | 31 | 25 | | | | |

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 | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 67 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 353 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 43 |
| 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 | 36 |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 | 31 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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.

Mathematics proficiency scores; gaps in students' mathematics knowledge from previous foundational years

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

Reading proficiency; due to scoring formula which includes writing score

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.

Mathematics proficiency; continuous gaps in foundational math skills

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

Science proficiency; continuous focus in 5th grade on science standards

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

ELA proficiency for economically disadvantaged students; Mathematics proficiency for economically disadvantaged students

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

1. achievement of economically disadvantaged students in ELA
2. achievement of economically disadvantaged students in Mathematics
3. gains in achievement of economically disadvantaged students in ELA
4. gains in achievement of economically disadvantaged students in Mathematics
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Teaching with Poverty in Mind - use of strategies from book study to increase student engagement and ultimately student achievement, particularly 4th and 5th grade students showing gains. Data collection and review during PLC's will include specifically looking at ethnic groups for each assessment for small group instruction: black, multiracial and students with disabilities. |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Measurable Outcome: | greater than 50% of the 4th and 5th grade students will show gains in achievement on state testing including each subgroup listed above |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Kristine Claffie (kristine.claffie@hcps.net) |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Evidence-based Strategy: | book study of teaching with poverty in mind to finalize strategy |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | to focus on the economically disadvantaged students particularly those in 4th & 5th grade |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Action Steps to Implement

First, we will implement the teaching with poverty book study with the whole staff. The teacher leaders were the facilitators for the groups. After we finished the book study, each group decided on an area of focus as a priority to help the school move forward. The instructional leader team will meet to discuss the priorities and pick one to utilize within the school.

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Person Responsible | Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net) |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Model classrooms for teacher observation for strategy implementation from strategies for teaching with poverty in mind |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Measurable Outcome: | creation of model classrooms and schedule of teachers observations |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net) |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Evidence-based Strategy: | coaching; teachers observing practice in model classrooms |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | to implement strategies from book study to full fidelity |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|

Action Steps to Implement

First we implemented the teaching with poverty book study to use with the staff. The teacher leaders facilitated each group along with administration. After each group met for 6 weeks, they picked an area of priority to focus on for the school. Next the instructional team will meet with administration and choose one of areas of focus as a priority to utilize within the school.

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Person Responsible | Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net) |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Continuous improvement model through data driven instruction monitored through professional learning communities as well as collaborative planning

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.

Professional learning communities
Instructional Leadership Team
Teacher Leaders
SAC

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: Student Engagement | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |