Thompson Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Thompson Elementary

2020 E SHELL POINT RD, Ruskin, FL 33570

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Casey O'brienswope

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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: D (38%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (35%)
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

Thompson Elementary

2020 E SHELL POINT RD, Ruskin, FL 33570

[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 KG-5	Yes	84%

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	C	C	D	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.

To provide an education and support that enables each student to excel as a successful and responsible learner.

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:

Developing "TRAILBLAZERS" who will be successful in 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
Astacio, Milady	Principal	Uphold district and state educational policies. Create high expectations and support state benchmarks for students and teachers and track progress towards those goals. Develop programs that develop teacher performance. Provides guidance to make the school a better place. Regularly responds to concerns from parents and meets with community leaders.
O'Brienswope, Casey	Assistant Principal	To coordinate and facilitate testing across all grades throughout the school. Support in the implementation of instruction Serve as principal's designee
Saffold, Lana	Instructional Coach	Support teachers in planning and implementation of standards based lessons. Provide coaching support to teachers using effective teaching practices. Provide professional development opportunities. Work with students in small groups and instruct students at their readiness levels.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Casey O'brienswope

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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: D (38%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (35%)
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	100	87	113	115	108	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	31	22	36	24	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
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	9	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	115	121	105	147	143	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	766
Attendance below 90 percent	24	22	16	17	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	0	1	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	3	5	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	115	121	105	147	143	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	766
Attendance below 90 percent	24	22	16	17	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	0	1	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	3	5	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	42%	52%	57%	40%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	55%	58%	51%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	53%	36%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	36%	54%	63%	32%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	39%	57%	62%	45%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	51%	26%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	50%	53%	41%	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	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
	2018	33%	53%	-20%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	32%	55%	-23%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	26%	57%	-31%	64%	-38%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	60%	-26%
	2018	30%	54%	-24%	61%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	51%	-15%	53%	-17%
	2018	28%	52%	-24%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	9	45	50	19	39	33	5				
ELL	32	50	46	27	37	45	17				
BLK	49	68	70	44	36	60	41				
HSP	35	50	50	28	33	38	24				
WHT	56	61		53	61		76				
FRL	38	55	52	34	38	43	32				

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	16	38	33	18	36	40	14				
ELL	23	35	46	25	36	26	18				
BLK	36	36	46	40	51	31	24				
HSP	29	44	47	29	43	29	26				
WHT	46	47	30	56	60	60	50				
FRL	31	40	44	35	45	31	27				

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	20	36	25	20	35	15					
ELL	27	39	18	19	37	33	26				
BLK	38	49		33	35		47				
HSP	35	47	35	24	43	32	36				
WHT	61	61		50	58		60				
FRL	36	51	38	29	44	28	38				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	53
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
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.

Fourth grade math demonstrated the lowest performance. Students entered fourth grade with only 32 percent proficient. Therefore, learning gaps needed to be closed, skills taught, reinforced and applied. The utilization of differentiated instruction was not a primary focus while creating lessons. This is not a consistent trend, last year Science was the lowest performing component.

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

Fourth grade math proficiency drastically declined by 15% this year. Students entered fourth grade with only 32 percent proficient. Therefore, learning gaps needed to be closed, skills taught, reinforced and applied. The utilization of differentiated instruction was not a primary focus while creating lessons. This cohort of students declined by 6% overall.

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.

Fourth grade math has the greatest gap with 38% difference from the state. Fourth grade math has been consistently 20% points below the state average in years past. Some contributing factors are: The need to differentiate the curriculum to meet the learning needs of all students. The ability for students and teachers to understand the standards to their complexity. Students to be able to apply test taking strategies ie. (gridding responses) and selecting multi select responses on assessments.

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

Third grade math showed the most improvement in proficiency by increasing 13% in proficiency. The actions in place were: additional 30 minutes devoted to math were focused learning groups met with the teachers. These groups were provided with differentiated activities to meet the learners needs. The grade utilized common assessments and made the necessary adjustments to the pacing calendar. We devote more time to the standards that were the major standards in third grade that accounted for 48 percent of the FSA.

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

One potential area that we will improve upon is our attendance rate to be above 90 percent. The data shows several students that need improvement with attendance.

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

1. ELA/Math
2. SWD
3. Hispanic Sub Group
4. ELL Sub Group
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will be equipped to engage all learners through differentiated instruction. So that students can received tailored instruction around standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to reach a minimum of 41% in proficiency in all content areas during 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be actively participating in weekly grade level professional learning communities with instructional coaches and administrators focused on differentiation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC's will provide opportunities for teachers to increase their capacity in creating differentiated activities based on their student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly Planning Sessions, coaching and modeling, providing feedback, data analysis, professional development with Content specific Instructional coaches to include substitutes for teacher coverage. Math Resource Teachers will be responsible for providing data-driven, small group instruction to targeted students to improve their academic proficiency as needed. The Reading Coach and Response to Intervention Resource will be expected to maintain and monitor the implementation of the district's K-12 reading program, including developing classroom teachers in order to improve reading instruction and acquisition. Throughout the school year, Reading Coaches focus on enhancing teachers' literacy instruction through job-embedded professional development (PD) and coaching. Reading coaches provide support through collaborative standards-based lesson-planning, the modeling of best practices in reading instruction, classroom-based demonstrations, and reflective teaching. They assist teachers in disaggregating data for interpretation and planning for instruction. The Math Resource Teachers assist teachers in planning for and implementing standards-based instruction and assessment, providing just-in-time, job-embedded coaching utilizing a strong knowledge base of mathematics content and pedagogy. Math Resource Teachers conduct PD for classroom teachers and school leadership regarding instructional strategies, best practices, use of materials, and effective teaching techniques..

Person Responsible   Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

Small group math/reading rotations to include additional paras for instruction, supplemental materials and common assessments. The school will braid TSSSA and other funds Title One to hire paraprofessionals who will support academic instruction in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade classrooms. These paraprofessionals will work directly with students to support guided practice in reading and math.

Person Responsible   Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

Through academic coaching the resource staff will provide professional development to teachers to help ensure instructional and student success, as well as direct instruction designed to improve academic proficiency. Professional development to include: institutes, conferences, school visits, training(s) focused on differentiated instruction and implementation and technology, equipment and software. Summer Planning for teachers to include stipends and pay for planning on non student days.Thompson Summer Math/Reading/Science Camp to include teachers, ELP and supplementary materials To address potential summer learning loss and aid in the critical transition to intermediate grades for students,Thompson Elementary will implement a summer program focused on reading and math skill retention and new skill acquisition. This summer program will allow students to – through small group instruction – push their academics forward to meet grade-level benchmarks.TSSSA funds will be used to cover associated t-payroll expenses.

Person Responsible Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

Implementation of Tier 2 and 3 Strategies to include SRA Math and/or Acaletics.
Thompson Elementary looks to stimulate the math instruction through the purchase of Acaletics via funding from TSSSA grant. Acaletics assists to improve the academic achievement of their students and close/eliminate any existing achievement gaps.
To further support its effort to attend to the needs of all learners, the school's Reading Resource Teacher funded using Title One funds, will be tasked with leading this work. An interactive data wall located in the principal's conference room will be continuously maintained and monitored by the Reading Resource Teacher, school administrators, and Problem Solving Leadership Team (PSLT). The Reading Resource Teacher along with the Response to Intervention Resource will assist teachers in analyzing student data Students' progress will be monitored via an interactive data wall, located in the principal's conference room. EL curriculum will be used in ELA to include all text, supplemental materials and common assessments.

Person Responsible Lana Saffold (lana.saffold@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To build a strong culture of communication that supports and includes parents in our efforts to increase student engagement and achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	There will be a 5 percent decrease among the students who exhibit 2 or more early warning sign indicators during the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Casey O'Brienswope (casey.obrienswope@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To implement PBIS school wide to promote intrinsic rewards among students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To improve the educational practices, work environment, build a school wide culture of mutual respect and support and student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

PBIS Committee will meet monthly/updates provided at staff meeting and attend monthly PBIS contact meetings.
Warning Signs Data Monthly-
The school's PBIS committee will meet monthly to analyze data, as well as to provide updates to school faculty. They will also be responsible for planning and implementing quarterly behavior celebrations to include character focused field trip experiences.

Person Responsible Casey O'Brienswope (casey.obrienswope@hcps.net)

Parent Engagement Team
The Parent Engagement team will work to empower parents and promote their engagement by bridging communication between the school and home. They will also cultivate parental interest in their children's school through advocacy efforts, as well as a range of special activities and events. For example, the school will host Trailblazer Academy Nights, family nights that focus on deepening content knowledge and expanding social-emotional learning opportunities.

Person Responsible Lana Saffold (lana.saffold@hcps.net)

Quarterly Behavior Celebrations to include character focused field trip experiences.
Thompson Elementary will develop a parent information board to support parent involvement in the school's culture, as well as provide strategies that aid parents in supporting classroom learning activities.

Person Responsible Casey O'Brienswope (casey.obrienswope@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will be equipped to engage all learners through differentiated instruction. So that students can received tailored instruction, questioning and tailored tasks around standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is for Hispanic, ELL and SWD groups to reach a minimum of 41% in proficiency in all content areas during 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be actively participating in weekly grade level professional learning communities with instructional coaches and administrators focused on differentiation. As well as an afternoon planning session with the coaches.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC's, additional planning sessions and book studies will provide opportunities for teachers to increase their capacity in creating differentiated activities based on their students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly Planning Sessions, coaching and modeling, providing feedback, data analysis, professional development with Content specific Instructional coaches to include substitutes for teacher coverage. Math Resource Teachers -will be responsible for providing data-driven, small group instruction to targeted students to improve their academic proficiency as needed. The Reading Coach will be expected to maintain and monitor the implementation of the district's K-12 reading program, including developing classroom teachers in order to improve reading instruction and acquisition. Throughout the school year, Reading Coaches focus on enhancing teachers' literacy instruction through job-embedded professional development (PD) and coaching. Reading coaches and Response to Intervention Resource provide support through collaborative standards-based lesson-planning, the modeling of best practices in reading instruction, classroom-based demonstrations, and reflective teaching. They assist teachers in disaggregating data for interpretation and planning for instruction. The Math Resource Teachers assist teachers in planning for and implementing standards-based instruction and assessment, providing just-in-time, job-embedded coaching utilizing a strong knowledge base of mathematics content and pedagogy. Math Resource Teachers conduct PD for classroom teachers and school leadership regarding instructional strategies, best practices, use of materials, and effective teaching techniques.

Person Responsible	Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

Professional Development centered on Differentiation through all content areas.

Person Responsible	Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An AIS (Academic Intervention Specialist) to increase proficiency and confidence in struggling readers so that the students can become lifelong, avid readers. The AIS will work collaboratively with other members of the school literacy team to promote higher levels of reading achievement for all students. Through collaboration, the AIS will enhance teachers' skills and knowledge of strategies in the five components of reading and oral language, in order to impact the success of all students.

School Wide Para Professionals will be working directly with students to assist with differentiation and assisting in with filing in learning gaps.

The Resource and Content Instructional Coaches and RTI will be working directly with students by providing lessons that are differentiated within small groups.

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.

The school works at building positive relationships with families and community stakeholders. We offer academic and social events to encourage parental participation and input throughout the year. Student progress is communicated via quarterly progress alerts and parent teacher conferences.

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
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00