

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Town & Country 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Town & Country Elementary School

6025 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Otis Kitchen

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

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 (56%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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

Town & Country Elementary School

6025 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[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	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide students with the tools to create their own vision for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student can excel.

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
	Other	Prior principal
Kitchen, Otis	Principal	School Leader
Garcia, Hilary	Other	This school leader will monitor and maintain comprehensible instruction for English Language Learners.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/30/2020, Otis Kitchen

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

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 (56%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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	64	52	51	56	58	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	330
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	12	8	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	52%	57%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	55%	58%	64%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	63%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	54%	63%	44%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	57%	62%	60%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	51%	46%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	50%	53%	49%	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	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	43%	53%	-10%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
	2018	36%	55%	-19%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	57%	-9%	64%	-16%
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	51%	1%	53%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	30	29	32	45	40					
ELL	55	64	44	51	72	60	52				
BLK	25			27							
HSP	58	64	52	54	64	54	61				
WHT	67			73							
FRL	55	61	52	53	63	44	54				
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	4	27	31	25	60	58					
ELL	30	40	44	43	65	56	30				
HSP	41	43	42	44	65	48	55				
WHT	33			47	50						
FRL	41	43	44	46	64	56	57				
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	13	47	60	31	41						
ELL	42	67	80	39	55	46	36				
BLK	55			55							
HSP	53	62	62	43	57	28	52				
WHT	47	79		32	71						
FRL	52	64	64	42	61	48	48				

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	70
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	57
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.

Math bottom quartile was the lowest performance. Although our school focuses on Math as a priority, Reading/ELA tends to get the greater sense of urgency.

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

Math bottom quartile was the lowest performance. Although our school focuses on Math as a priority, Reading/ELA tends to get the greater sense of urgency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math achievement is the lowest performing compared to the state.

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

ELA Learning gains showed the most improvement. Our school was very invested in the I-Ready program as well as using the Newsela to help increase student vocabulary.

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

Math bottom quartile gains

ELA bottom quartile gains

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

1. Math bottom quartile gains
2. Student achievement in sub groups (Black and SWD)
3. ELA bottom quartile gains
4. Science proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Academic achievement for students in the Bottom Quartile and targeted sub-groups (Students With Disabilities and Black/African American students).
 Rationale
 Students in the ELA Bottom Quartile made 52 % gains and the Students with Disabilities and Black students are under the 41% threshold. Students in the Math Bottom Quartile made 46% gains and Students with Disabilities and Black students the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome: Students in the bottom quartile and targeted subgroups (Students With Disabilities and Black/African American) will make a 15% gain in proficiency and learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Content area resource teachers will plan individually with teachers to help incorporate evidence-based teaching strategies throughout their lessons. Professional development will be provided to teachers based on current best practices and evidence-based strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This is the most direct avenue to provide support to our teachers which then provides a direct link to student learning

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly planning sessions with content area specialists

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The Math/Science resource teachers as well as District Reading Coach will work with teachers to develop strategies to differentiate instruction for struggling students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Provide Professional development in differentiating teaching for struggling learners

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Leadership Team will analyze the students in the bottom quartile bi-weekly to ensure that they are receiving additional support in the classroom

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities several ways.

- 1. Progress monitor teacher effectiveness through PLC logs and walkthrough data trends.**
- 2. Progress monitor student data using state, district, and individual teacher assessments.**
- 3. Ensure continuous professional development opportunities are provided and knowledge gain is implemented with fidelity.**

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.

Town and Country Elementary builds positive relations with parents through ongoing communication in both English and Spanish. We will hold several events throughout the year that provide support for parents with their child's learning and also to recognize their child's accomplishments. Town and Country Elementary actively pursues business partnerships within our community. After we have established partnerships within our community, we have our partners serve on our School Advisory Council and PTA. Our community partners also mentor students and provide incentives for students and staff.

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				\$438,026.01
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$74,330.15
			<i>Notes: Reading coach</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$74,330.15

			<i>Notes: Science Resource</i>			
5100	100-Salaries	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$45,388.42	
			<i>Notes: Math resource</i>			
5100	100-Salaries	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$90,660.84	
			<i>Notes: RTI coach</i>			
5100	510-Supplies	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$30,000.00	
			<i>Notes: classroom supplies, copy paper, printer toner, laminating film, headphones, behavior plan materials, and other assorted classroom supplies.</i>			
5100	643-Capitalized Hardware and Technology-Related Infrastructure	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$30,000.00	
			<i>Notes: Laptop Computer carts with 23 laptops each</i>			
6400	510-Supplies	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00	
			<i>Notes: books and materials for professional development</i>			
5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	10.0	\$20,000.00	
			<i>Notes: tpayroll</i>			
6400	390-Other Purchased Services	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$6,600.00	
			<i>Notes: Subs for PD 60 days</i>			
5100	100-Salaries	4441 - Town & Country Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$64,716.45	
			<i>Notes: Salary Differential</i>			
Total:					\$438,026.01	