Trapnell Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Trapnell Elementary School

1605 W TRAPNELL RD, Plant City, FL 33566

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Krissy Perkins

Start Date for this Principal: 12/4/2017

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: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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

Trapnell Elementary School

1605 W TRAPNELL RD, Plant City, FL 33566

[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	82%

School Grades History

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

District Mission: To provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Trapnell Mission: To create successful learners by teaching students to be safe and responsible, be respectful, focus on learning, be a problem solver, and talk it out.

Provide the school's vision statement.

District Vision: Preparing students for life.

Trapnell Vision: Students first.

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
Perkins, Krissy	Principal	Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers ELL team PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches) The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County. HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development. Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact. Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 12/4/2017, Krissy Perkins

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.*
3

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	68	68	82	91	88	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	16	17	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	3	2	3	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	81	89	96	93	68	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	519
Attendance below 90 percent	3	11	11	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	21	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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%	47%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	55%	58%	51%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	53%	45%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	54%	63%	59%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	57%	62%	71%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	46%	51%	63%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	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	46%	52%	-6%	58%	-12%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	55%	-13%	58%	-16%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	-3%					
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	-14%					
Cohort Comparison	-8%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	57%	-8%	64%	-15%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison	-9%					
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
	2018	74%	54%	20%	61%	13%
Same Grade Comparison	-16%					
Cohort Comparison	6%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	40%	51%	-11%	53%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison	-15%					
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	16	33	35	31	53	53	22				
ELL	32	48	48	53	68	61	24				
BLK	40	44		38	50		45				
HSP	37	53	46	53	65	56	31				
WHT	48	23		64	63		60				
FRL	38	48	40	51	63	54	35				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	24	16	40	54	50	25				
ELL	31	33	21	56	57	55	38				
BLK	43	39		46	65		45				
HSP	46	44	24	62	62	56	54				
WHT	58	27		73	61		65				
FRL	47	40	24	61	63	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	20	35	31	22	50	48	6				
ELL	38	43	38	56	71	65	14				
BLK	31	26		50	63						
HSP	44	49	46	60	79	64	33				
WHT	60	67		61	60		55				
FRL	44	47	43	58	70	59	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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	52
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	43
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	52
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	52
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	51
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.

The ELA and Math achievement of our SWDs showed the lowest performance. Our ESE numbers have grown tremendously, having added an instructional unit for a total of 5 VE teachers.

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

ELA Achievement overall showed the greatest decline, but specifically SWDs. Many intermediate teachers are teaching self-contained classrooms, which is not allowing our teachers to specialize in only a couple of subject areas.

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.

4th and 5th grade ELA as well as 4th grade Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Many students coming into 4th grade barely passed the 3rd grade FSA (usually by portfolio or getting a low 2). When faced with 4th grade curriculum, they fall even farther behind.

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

ELA Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile showed improvement, as well as ELL Math Learning Gains. Concerning ELA gains, continuing the use of our Reading Resource Teacher as she uses the LLI curriculum for our bottom quartile students is working to raise those gains.

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

Kindergarten attendance continues to be a concern, with 10 students attending school less than 90% of the time.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. Math Learning Gains
4. Math Bottom Quartile
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a school, we are struggling to move all learners forward by one or more years in ELA. As our learners leave fifth grade, they should be reading on a fifth grade level in order to be prepared for and successful in middle school. While our ELA Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile increased (by 7% and 16% respectively), our ELA Achievement decreased by 7 percent (2018 to 2019).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA Achievement to 50%+ for the 2021 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Krissy Perkins (krissy.perkins@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1) Learners in grades K-2 will receive systematic phonics instruction daily, utilizing Really Great Reading (Blast!, Countdown, and HD Word) curriculum kits for Tier 1 support (or other as deemed necessary by the district). SWDs in grades K-5 may also receive systematic phonics instruction weekly, utilizing BrainSpring curriculum for Tier 2/3 support. 2) Learners in grades 3-5 will have a set time within the Reading Block during the week for Independent Reading and Independent Reading Conferences focusing on vocabulary and utilizing ELL strategies as appropriate.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale: Many learners don't come to school Kindergarten-ready and take years to catch up to their grade level peers. 44% of our learners are ELL; 87% are FRL. They have a hard time accessing grade-level text due to reading deficits (mostly phonics and vocabulary) and stamina. There is no specific, systematic phonics curriculum that is uniform across the district. Research: 1) Academic Interventions for Elementary and Middle School Students with Low Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (Dietrichson, Jens; Bøg, Martin; Filges, Trine; Klint Jørgensen, Anne-Marie) --> This research supports feedback to students on their independent reading and vocabulary acquisition and monitoring of their progress. 2) Eight factors for realizing better classroom teaching through support, feedback and intensive, individualized professional learning (Jim Knight) --> This research supports the use of a Reading Coach and Reading Resource Teacher who often serve as an instructional coach to push teacher practice forward.

Action Steps to Implement	

A full time Reading Coach will be utilized and will:
- meet with all grade-level ELA teachers every four weeks in an intensive planning session.
- provide differentiated coaching and professional development for ELA teachers as appropriate throughout the school year.
- provide intensive instruction in ELA for K-5 students as appropriate.
- engage in additional ELA activities as necessary in order to positively impact student achievement.

Person Responsible	Wendy Wilson (wendy.wilson@hcps.net)

A full time Reading Resource Teacher will be utilized and will:
- meet with all grade-level ELA teachers every four weeks in an intensive planning session.
- provide direct instruction to at-risk readers in grades 2-5 as determined at the beginning of the school

year (based on initial student data).
- engage in additional ELA activities as necessary in order to positively impact student achievement.

Person Responsible Olga Patino (olga.patino@hcps.net)

Pending district approval of a county-wide phonics program, we will purchase the HD Word phonics program for 2nd grade teachers (Really Great Reading) so that phonics instruction can be uniform at our site.

Person Responsible Wendy Wilson (wendy.wilson@hcps.net)

Pending district guidance on required elements/structure of ELA instruction, we will implement Independent Reading blocks including reading conferences focused on vocabulary and utilizing ELL strategies as appropriate in order to increase stamina.

Person Responsible Wendy Wilson (wendy.wilson@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a disparity in our Math Achievement and Math Learning Gains- our Black students and SWDs are not achieving as well as other subgroups and as well as they did in previous years.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math Achievement to 60%+ for the 2021 FSA Math. Increase Math Achievement of our SWDs (31% to 50%+) and Black Learners (38% to 50%+) for the 2021 FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Krissy Perkins (krissy.perkins@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Wherever possible in the intermediate grades, teachers will departmentalize (ELA and Math/Science) in order to allow for a more equitable focus on instruction and learners within those content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research: 1) Learning Communities: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment (Shirley Hord) --> supports departments working together collaboratively in their respective subject areas to increase student achievement. 2) Research-Based Practices for Engaging Students in STEM Learning (Vanessa Vega) --> This supports teachers specializing in STEM and increasing Science and Math scores.

Action Steps to Implement

Design the teaching assignments to allow for departmentalization at grades three, four, and five.

Person Responsible	Krissy Perkins (krissy.perkins@hcps.net)

An administrator will be utilized and will:
- meet with all grade-level Math teachers every four weeks in an intensive planning session.
- provide direct instruction to at-risk math learners in grades 3-5 as determined at the beginning of the year (based on initial student data).

Person Responsible	Krissy Perkins (krissy.perkins@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our SWD ELA Achievement fell below the Federal Index (39%) in 2019. As a result, our SWDs are not on par with their grade-level peers in achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Our SWDs will increase their ELA Achievement from 16% to 40%+ on the 2021 ELA FSA. Our SWDs will increase their Math Achievement from 24% to 40%+ on the 2021 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Krissy Perkins (krissy.perkins@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All five VE teachers will be actively engaged in monthly, intensive planning sessions with content teachers, Reading Coach, Reading Resource Teacher, and Administration in order to communicate about and advocate for SWDs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Previously, there has not been a uniform, systematic way for VE teachers and content teachers to plan intensively due to the time constraints and demands.

Action Steps to Implement

Create the school calendar at the beginning of the year, planning for the intensive grade-level planning sessions, calendaring them, and communicating effectively with teachers about their purpose, structure, and desired outcomes.

Person Responsible	Krissy Perkins (krissy.perkins@hcps.net)

A Leadership Team member will attend all planning sessions, provide feedback to grade levels about progress towards goals, and discuss progress with the Leadership Team.

Person Responsible	Krissy Perkins (krissy.perkins@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Below are a list of activities and events that will occur this school year (pending CDC and district guidelines for implementation of such). These activities and events are created, scheduled, and conducted in an effort to promote a positive school culture and environment.

* School Advisory Committee (SAC): meets monthly and is composed of staff members, community members, and parents. The goal for SAC is to bring stakeholders together to make decisions that are in the best interest of our students.

* Migrant Parent Advisory Council (MPAC): meets twice per year and is composed of our Migrant Advocate, ESOL Resource Teacher, and parents of Migrant students. The purpose of this council is to offer information and support to parents as well as listen to their valuable input.

* PTA Fall Festival: once per year, this event brings all of our students, staff, and community members together.

* PTA Spring BBQ/Talent & Art Show: once per year, this event brings all of our students, staff, and community members together.

* Parent Nights: Science Night, Ready at Five Night, Make & Take Night, Chorus Programs, Book Fairs, etc. These events are open to all of our students and families and seek to promote academic achievement and parent/community involvement.

* Local High Schools (Durant and Plant City): Local high school students volunteer their time through translating during parent conference nights and assisting with other events as needed.

* Community Organizations: (Plant City Church of God, Transforming Life Church, First Baptist of Plant City, etc.) These organizations donate backpacks, school supplies, money, clothing, holiday gifts, meals, etc. to our families.

* Great American Teach-In: The event opens the doors to community members and parents and encourages our students to consider various jobs and careers.

* Clothes Closet: Occurs twice per year; through this event, we are able to offer parents and community members the opportunity to acquire life's necessities such as clothing and other household items they may need.

* Parent Breakfast and Grandparents' Breakfast: twice during the year

* Sanford Harmony SEL Program: components of this program are taught daily by K-5 teachers. The program addresses various social-emotional needs of students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$187,480.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	4481 - Trapnell Elementary School			$79,255.00
			Notes: 1.0 Reading Coach Salary			
		100-Salaries	4481 - Trapnell Elementary School			$75,225.00
			Notes: 1.0 Reading Resource Teacher			
		399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	4481 - Trapnell Elementary School			$30,000.00
			Notes: To keep well-functioning, updated technology in classrooms and three computer labs.			
		500-Materials and Supplies	4481 - Trapnell Elementary School			$3,000.00
			Notes: ELA Book Studies and inservice provided throughout the year.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$4,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		590-Other Materials and Supplies	4481 - Trapnell Elementary School			$4,000.00
			Notes: Math Book Studies and inservice provided throughout the year.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning**				**$13,195.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		140-Substitute Teachers	4481 - Trapnell Elementary School			$5,000.00
			Notes: Substitutes to cover entire grade levels for intensive planning for ELA and Math.			
		590-Other Materials and Supplies	4481 - Trapnell Elementary School			$8,195.00
			Notes: Basic needs/supplies of teachers to provide quality instruction to students in all academic areas.			
					Total:	**$204,675.00**