# Westchase Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Westchase Elementary School

### 9517 W LINEBAUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33626

### [ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Alexa Trafficante                    Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 24% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (72%)<br><br>2017-18: A (65%)<br><br>2016-17: A (71%)<br><br>2015-16: A (70%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |

> \* 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

# Westchase Elementary School

### 9517 W LINEBAUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33626

### [ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | No | 22% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 43% |

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Preparing Students for Life!

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

A successful school requires strong leadership in all aspects, including administration, teachers, staff, parents, outside community members, and students. Working together as a team, we will achieve the ultimate goal of having each child reach their full potential academically, socially, and emotionally, so they are fully prepared for the life that lies ahead of them.

### 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 |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Suarez, Elise | Principal | Leadership team meetings can include the following:<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator<br>Guidance Counselor<br>SAC Chairs<br>School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative<br>School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative<br>Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis)<br>ESE teachers<br>PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area<br>District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches)<br>The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core<br>Leadership Team is to:<br>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.<br>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1)<br>and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.<br>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction<br>and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.<br>4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the<br>content/grade level teams.<br>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team<br>Meetings and PLCs.<br>Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in<br>teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to<br>ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop<br>strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The<br>Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to<br>experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills,<br>experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader.<br>Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school<br>culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| | | outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.<br>HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every<br>classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the<br>research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement<br>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,<br>HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the<br>district's vision of instructional improvement.<br>Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer<br>months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved<br>by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly<br>Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are<br>eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping<br>to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly<br>qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of<br>ongoing professional development.<br>Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties<br>salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such<br>as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary<br>schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who<br>have demonstrated positive student impact.<br>Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released<br>instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase<br>effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate<br>educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options<br>and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR<br>functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| | | 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**
Sunday 7/1/2018, Alexa Trafficante

**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.*
2

**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.*
13

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
68

**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) | 24% |
| **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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (65%) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 2016-17: A (71%) |
| | 2015-16: A (70%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information\*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| \* 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 | 130 | 147 | 148 | 147 | 150 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 882 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| 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 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

**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 | 150 | 150 | 160 | 169 | 170 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 947 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

### 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 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 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 | 150 | 150 | 160 | 169 | 170 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 947 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

### 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 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 | 83% | 52% | 57% | 81% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 68% | 55% | 58% | 64% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 63% | 50% | 53% | 54% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 84% | 54% | 63% | 85% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 75% | 57% | 62% | 71% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54% | 46% | 51% | 62% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 74% | 50% | 53% | 82% | 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 | 81% | 52% | 29% | 58% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 53% | 31% | 57% | 27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 83% | 55% | 28% | 58% | 25% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 55% | 23% | 56% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 80% | 54% | 26% | 56% | 24% |
| | 2018 | 74% | 51% | 23% | 55% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 83% | 54% | 29% | 62% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 55% | 27% | 62% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 82% | 57% | 25% | 64% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 57% | 21% | 62% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 81% | 54% | 27% | 60% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 54% | 24% | 61% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | 73% | 51% | 22% | 53% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 52% | 20% | 55% | 17% |
| 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 | 46 | 53 | 45 | 51 | 52 | 33 | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 58 | 54 | | 71 | 71 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 96 | 85 | | 98 | 93 | | 67 | | | | |
| BLK | 83 | 62 | | 68 | 46 | | 60 | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 59 | 55 | 64 | 57 | 41 | 46 | | | | |
| MUL | 79 | 58 | | 88 | 83 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 86 | 70 | 65 | 88 | 80 | 67 | 88 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 55 | 50 | 64 | 61 | 53 | 47 | | | | |

| 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 | 41 | 38 | 29 | 48 | 53 | 35 | 28 | | | | |
| ELL | 56 | 50 | 36 | 72 | 53 | | 70 | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | 65 | | 94 | 61 | | 82 | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 55 | | 60 | 55 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 65 | 51 | 39 | 66 | 59 | 42 | 58 | | | | |
| MUL | 82 | 75 | | 80 | 30 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 84 | 67 | 63 | 85 | 73 | 48 | 79 | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | 56 | 43 | 58 | 55 | 50 | 49 | | | | |

| 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 | 42 | 36 | 42 | 57 | 59 | 56 | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 54 | | 65 | 64 | 70 | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | 47 | | 93 | 80 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 87 | 40 | | 73 | 20 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 56 | 39 | 66 | 62 | 54 | 65 | | | | |
| MUL | 88 | 67 | | 88 | 83 | | 90 | | | | |
| WHT | 84 | 69 | 63 | 90 | 75 | 68 | 86 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 49 | 36 | 67 | 49 | 41 | 58 | | | | |

## 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 72 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 75 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 576 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 66 |
| 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 | 88 |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 77 |
| 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 | 78 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 and ELA bottom 25th percentile was the lowest performance. Not a trend.

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

We showed gains in every component. However, the smallest gain was in Math lowest 25th percentile.

**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.**

Our scores are above the state average in every component. However, the lowest 25th percentile in Math is closest to the state average.

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

The most improvement was shown on ELA lowest 25th percentile. There was a gain of 14 percentage points. For the 18-19 instructional year we focused on differentiated instruction. Our instructional priority was to raise the bar for alls tudents. We used iReady, reacding Coach guided reading cycle, data charts with ILT and reading Coach continued using a data wall, data analysis during report card checks.

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

1. Level 1 on statewide assessment.
2. Attendance below 90 percent.

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

1. Improve scores of the bottom quartile in reading.
2. Improve scores of the bottom quartile in math.
4.
5.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

## Areas of Focus:

### #1. Other specifically relating to Lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The data shows the lowest 25 percentile is one area for growth. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Students in the lowest 25th percentile will make a year's worth of growth in ELA and Math (SMART measurement). |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Elise Suarez (elise.suarez@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | To progress monitor the lowest 25th percentile we will utilize the following:<br>- data wall school wide<br>- iReady result: usage 45min a week, lesson success rate<br>- IReady progress monitor assessments for Tier 2,3 students (occur more often than iReady diagnostics)<br>- academic review<br>- Fall,Winter, Spring iReady diagnostic (included in data wall)<br>- ILT (instructional leadership team) |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | These strategies help progress monitor the students' performance, areas of need and improvement. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. instructional priority is progress monitoring
2. trainings: Standard Based instruction (unpacking the standards)
3. iReady fidelity
4. PLC (analyze data to make changes in instrction)
5. increase fidelity in RT
6. differentiated instruction

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Elise Suarez (elise.suarez@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.

Families are invited to various events held throughout the year, including Math/Science Night, Family Literacy Night, International Night, and Dinner and a Good Book. Also, there are two official parent-teacher conference nights held, while many teachers offer conferences throughout the year on an as-needed basis. Parents are also invited to join the School Advisory Council and all meeting dates and times are posted through the school newsletter.

### 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: Other: Lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math. | $0.00 |
|---|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | Total: | $0.00 |