Hillsborough County Public Schools

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary

12961 BOGGY CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33579

http://dawson.mysdhc.org/

Demographics

Principal: Jesha Womack

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2017

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
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 (43%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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

Warren Hope Dawson Elementary

12961 BOGGY CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33579

http://dawson.mysdhc.org/

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	No	50%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Together as a school family, we will foster a collaborative, trusting, and safe learning community to equitably meet the needs of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing HOPE for our future, one child at a time.

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
Mc Laughlin, Derrick	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 1/6/2017, Jesha Womack

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
37

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	No

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
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 (43%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade

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	106	114	122	126	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	697
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	19	11	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	5	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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
Monday 6/22/2020

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	13	22	14	13	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	9	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	22	14	13	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	9	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	50%	52%	57%	0%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	55%	58%	0%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	53%	0%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	54%	63%	0%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	31%	57%	62%	0%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	46%	51%	0%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	50%	53%	0%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%	
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	57%	-5%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%	
	2018	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		5%					
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%	
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%	
	2018	58%	55%	3%	62%	-4%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	35%	57%	-22%	64%	-29%	
	2018	53%	57%	-4%	62%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		-18%					
Cohort Comparison		-23%					
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%	
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	61%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		-13%					
Cohort Comparison		-14%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
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	22	52	63	15	36	50					
ELL	23	41		20	19						
BLK	52	63		36	23		29				
HSP	41	40	20	30	26	25	32				
MUL	54	41		62	41		36				
WHT	54	57	65	42	31	33	51				
FRL	32	46	52	29	30	32	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	22	35	31	31	62	56	29				
ELL	13	38	47	27	58	60	17				
BLK	56	36		50	70		47				
HSP	35	46	38	39	49	67	37				
MUL	39	33		61	67						
WHT	57	54	41	63	60	40	69				
FRL	35	41	38	40	57	55	43				
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

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	32

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	335
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	41
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	31
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47

Multiracial Students	
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	48
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The area of English Language Learner showed the lowest performance measure (27%). This is the second year in a row that our data was below 32% in this area Instruction was not differentiated enough for students in this subgroup.

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

Our largest decline was in the area of Math Learning gains in the black student subgroup (-47), followed closely by the hispanic and ELL subgroups (-42 and -39 respectively). All data in the area of Math declined last year due to both staffing issues and a lack of access to differentiated materials.

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.

The area of Math in both 4th and 5th grades showed the greatest gap when compared to state data (-29% in 4th and -21% in 5th). Again, a lack of adequate staffing and access to differentiated materials contributed to this decline.

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

In the area of ELA learning gains in the bottom quartile (lowest 25%) of the subgroup of SWD, Dawson saw an increase of 32 percentage points. This is attributed to an increase of ESE services and differentiated instruction by adequately trained educators.

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

Our greatest areas of concern are in the 4 subgroups not making adequate learning gains (SWD, ELL, Hispanic students, FRL students).

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

1. Math learning gains (overall)
2. Math learning gains (Lowest 25%)
3. ELL/Hispanic subgroups learning gains
4. SWD subgroup learning gains
5. FRL subgroup learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Meeting the needs of our diverse student population based on data collected (specifically learning gain and subgroup data), it was determined that several subgroups are struggling due to a lack of differentiated teaching and activities to fit their varied needs.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve the 4 subgroups not meeting ESSA standards to acceptable levels (above 41%), and improve overall Federal Index to (at least) 44%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Derrick Mc Laughlin (derrick.mclaughlin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intentionally differentiating our teaching to move kids toward standards achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through differentiating both the process and product of teaching, students can attain critical skills needed to show their understanding and learning in a variety of ways.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Deliver targeted small group instruction in specific areas of need.
2. Utilize SMathSmarts (Standards Snapshots, GCG Learning Goals & Steps, etc.) to maintain high expectations for achievement while planning for differentiation.
3. Participate in coaching cycles with an equity focus to inform differentiated instruction.
4. Implement SIPPS instruction with fidelity.
5. Engage in additional professional development in LAFS, iReady, and Achieve 3000 for the purpose of intentionally differentiating instruction.

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.

Through regular ILT meetings where on going data is discussed and acted upon, our intention is to address ALL areas of school improvement priorities with the above mentioned steps.

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.

Throughout the year, the Instructional Leadership Team, School Advisory Council, and PTA regularly meet to discuss both academic and cultural/environmental needs. Specifically the information gathered from the annual ASQi survey is collected, compared to previous years, and a plan of action is created to sustain our strongest areas of cultural/environmental components (respect and rapport, trust, professional autonomy). We have also planned on how to address our areas of growth (understanding of student conduct/needs, school cleanliness, and professional time on task).

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00