Valrico Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Valrico Elementary School

609 S MILLER RD, Valrico, FL 33594

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tricia Simonsen   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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

Valrico Elementary School

609 S MILLER RD, Valrico, FL 33594

[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	No	60%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

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

Engage Every Learner

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspire lifelong learning and success.

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
Simonsen, Tricia	Principal	
Bisesto, Heather	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Tricia Simonsen

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
55

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	93	123	116	112	114	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	674
Attendance below 90 percent	7	15	16	17	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
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	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	3	4	7	0	0	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	128	121	124	138	140	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	16	15	10	13	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	31	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	128	121	124	138	140	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	16	15	10	13	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	31	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	67%	52%	57%	61%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	55%	58%	58%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	54%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	54%	63%	68%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	62%	59%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	46%	51%	46%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	50%	53%	65%	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	65%	52%	13%	58%	7%
	2018	69%	53%	16%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	54%	11%	62%	3%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	57%	-1%	64%	-8%
	2018	74%	57%	17%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	71%	54%	17%	60%	11%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	51%	18%	53%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	40	47	38	39	44	9	42				
ELL	57	76	64	46	53	38	42				
ASN	82			82							
BLK	55	53		45	41						
HSP	70	71	52	65	59	31	62				
MUL	67			67							
WHT	68	66	66	69	59	45	77				
FRL	60	63	50	58	52	36	61				

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	37	43	45	49	54	44	35				
ELL	48	44	27	55	63	50					
ASN	80			70							
BLK	62	56		56	50		73				
HSP	67	61	45	73	71	48	65				
MUL	77			69							
WHT	69	59	53	70	73	56	72				
FRL	59	54	44	60	65	45	58				

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	26	47	50	40	45	37	38				
ELL	24	43	50	44	54	54	38				
BLK	53	54		52	48		31				
HSP	52	56	50	67	59	54	57				
MUL	53	44		59	31		70				
WHT	67	64	61	72	65	53	73				
FRL	48	53	51	58	53	47	51				

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	56
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	61

Hispanic Students	
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
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 learning gains for the bottom quartile - we will reflect on how we are providing services to our ESE students as well as intensify planning to dig deeper into the standards to ensure all students are making gains.

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

Math learning gains for the bottom quartile - we will reflect on how we are providing services to our ESE students as well as intensify planning to dig deeper into the standards to ensure all students are making gains.

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 learning gains for the bottom quartile - we will reflect on how we are providing services to our ESE students as well as intensify planning to dig deeper into the standards to ensure all students are making gains.

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

Reading learning gains for the bottom quartile - increased vertical team meetings and professional development.

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

Our biggest area of concern is the number of students that are below the 90% attendance rate.

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

1. Learning gains of the bottom quartile in math
2. Learning gains of students with disabilities
3. Overall math learning gains
4. Learning gains of the bottom quartile in reading
5. Attendance for number of students with 20 or more absences

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning gains of students with disabilities; Students identified as the bottom quartile in math
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities will increase learning gains to meet the 41% threshold. This is an increase from 37%. At least 62% of the students identified as being in the bottom quartile for math will demonstrate learning gains. This is an increase from the 38%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will engage in Instructional Design Sessions (IDS) to plan , monitor, and assess student learning experiences that result in mastery of grade level standards and individual learning gain goals
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Purposeful Differentiated Instruction More Rigorous Lessons Meaningful Assessment of Standards

Action Steps to Implement

1. IDS implemented bi-weekly
2. Teachers track student growth and identifying trends upon release of site and district assessments
3. Vertical teams discuss specific strategies and whole school implications
4. eLearning planning and instruction as needed
5. Specific teacher created look-fors directly related to planning in reading, math, and science

Person Responsible	Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@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.

1. Tier 1 Supports

Character Education
• Character Education: Core Essentials by Chick-fil-a
• Monthly guidance lessons K-5 delivered by School Counselors
• Sanford Harmony

Positive Behavior Plan
• Character Counts Ribbons
o Students nominated by any staff member for demonstrating outstanding character. Nominations are drawn at random every Friday morning during the Morning Show. Students receive
a special spirit stick.

Citizenship
• Award recognition in classrooms and during award ceremonies for excellent work and study habits

Terrific Kids
• Terrific Kids is supported by the Kiwanis Club of Brandon.
• One student demonstrating outstanding character is chosen by each homeroom teacher as the Terrific Kid of the month.
• Students are celebrated during an awards ceremony.

Safety Patrol Training
• Monthly meetings to support leadership and character education.

Student Leadership
• 5th grade students apply for and assume roles of Teacher Helpers, Media Helpers, and Recycle Team members.
• Peer Mediators actively participate in service project, SEEDS of Hope.

Extra-Curricular Activities
• Chorus
• Math Leagues
• TiViTz

Mentoring
• Student/teacher mentoring sessions designed to aid in social/emotional and academic needs.

Bully Prevention
• District staff training on bullying.
• All classrooms participate in a bully prevention guidance lesson.
• Red Ribbon Week promotes healthy behaviors and commitment to bully-free behaviors.
• Kids on the Block presentation regarding bullying.

Classroom Behavior Support
• Through collaboration with the Valrico Elementary Guidance and Hawks Traits committees, the following options are available for teachers dealing with a problematic behavior in the classroom:
o Classroom behavior systems.
o Refocus area (student sits for a few minutes and either reads a book or writes in a journal to calm down and
prepare to rejoin the class).
o Classroom to classroom support.
o Pairing non-preferred activities with preferred activities.

o Utilizing momentum compliance.
o Student Services may assist with individualized behavior plans.
o Teacher may call student services for support if none of the above options are working.

Instructional Design Sessions (IDS)
• Administration and Student Services support grade level planning and problem solving sessions (academic and behavior needs).

2. Tier 2 Supports

Peer Mediation
• Many "disciplinary" issues involve disagreements/misunderstandings between peers.
• Five 5th grade students are trained peer mediators.
o Students will serve as mediators to help students solve conflict and develop problem solving strategies.

Group & Individual Counseling
• Targeted groups focusing on behavior, social skills, friendship, etc. meet for 6 week cycles.
• Solution-focused individual counseling available for students, as needed.

Problem Solving Leadership Team (PSLT)
• The Problem Solving Leadership Team examines data and has on-going collaboration
• Teachers are invited to collaborate with the Problem Solving Leadership Team on any students with significant academic or behavior concerns.

3. Tier 3 Supports

Hawks Traits Committee
• Tier 3 problem solving for behaviors.
• Assistance with development of interventions to aide with student success.
Functional Behavioral Analysis Team
• Formal behavioral team comprised of administration, student services, ESE representatives and classroom
teachers.

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: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00