



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

## Carrollwood K 8 School

3516 MCFARLAND RD, Tampa, FL 33618

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Maryjo Stover**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Carrollwood K 8 School

3516 MCFARLAND RD, Tampa, FL 33618

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>47%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>58%</p>

## School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year Grade		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.**

Carrollwood Elementary School will be a leader in developing high performing students who are prepared for life.

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

Carrollwood Elementary School will prepare students for life.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stover, Mary Jo	Principal	Maintain the campus and the instructional responsibilities of students and staff.
Testoni, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in monitoring and maintaining the campus and instructional learning.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/1/2019, Maryjo Stover

**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.*

5

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

55

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

650

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Demographic Data

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

**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	104	95	120	99	111	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	10	10	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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**

Tuesday 6/15/2021

**2020-21 - 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	88	115	105	101	105	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	11	3	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	1	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**2020-21 - 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	88	115	105	101	105	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	11	3	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	1	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				71%	57%	61%	70%	59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	56%	59%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	52%	54%	51%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				64%	55%	62%	67%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains				49%	57%	59%	56%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27%	49%	52%	37%	47%	52%
Science Achievement				66%	50%	56%	63%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					77%	78%		79%	77%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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	2021					
	2019	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison -71%						
05	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison -70%						
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison -62%						
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison 0%						
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

Grades 1 - 5, ELA & Math: iReady Nationally Normed Percentiles  
 5th Grade Science: District Interim assessments for fall, winter, and spring

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36%	42%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	34%	47.5%
	Students With Disabilities	6.25%	7%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24%	37.5%	57.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	31%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	6.25%	13%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	14%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46%	43%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	23%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	12%	11%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22%	34%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8.5%	13%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	18%	23.5%
	English Language Learners	0%	12.5%	11%

<b>Grade 3</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63%	42%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	17%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	15%	33%
	English Language Learners	0%	12.5%	20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26.8%	19.7%	38.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	7.8%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	7.1%	8%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	15.5%	10%
<b>Grade 4</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44%	29.5%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.5%	24%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	4%	8%
	English Language Learners	14%	14%	14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29%	11%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	7%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	4%	21%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	28%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	21%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	6%	12%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36%	27%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.5%	15%	26.5%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	0%	12%
	English Language Learners	10%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	65%	77%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	54%	68%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	50%	50%
	English Language Learners	11%	30%	20%

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	40	52	54	35	50	43	40				
ELL	42	50	50	36	43		18				
BLK	45			52							
HSP	60	66	53	52	59	50	54				
MUL	50			57							
WHT	76	67		74	61		67				
FRL	50	56	42	46	46	35	52				
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	39	44	32	37	37	16	36				
ELL	33	32	18	33	29	22					
ASN	83	60		92	73						

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
BLK	54	63		50	26	20					
HSP	63	56	30	58	49	32	72				
MUL	64	50		43	30						
WHT	79	54	39	71	53	26	70				
FRL	55	50	31	43	35	28	44				
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	30	45	46	31	36	26	25				
ELL	50	71	75	57	57	36	27				
ASN	88			94							
BLK	53	55		36	32		45				
HSP	67	64	66	61	56	46	50				
MUL	54	25		63	42						
WHT	76	63	38	76	60	20	76				
FRL	57	57	53	54	49	41	45				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
---	----



English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Subgroup Analysis:

ELL students were the lowest performing subgroup in all content areas. Students with Disabilities made gains in ELA, however they did not show the same level of performance in math. Student on Free and Reduced Lunch were the strongest performing subgroup.

Overall:

Math proficiency is lower than reading school wide.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math is the greatest need school-wide. Based on iReady and FSA data, we see a particular deficiency with fractions and geometry. All subgroups (ELL, SWD & FRL) need additional support with Operations and Algebraic Thinking.

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing Factors:

- Lack of foundational skills, particularly vocabulary (school-wide, most notably within the ELL & SWD populations)
- COVID/eLearning/quarantine students not participating or doing the work. Transient students moving back and forth from eLearning to brick and mortar.

Actions:

- ELL/SWD: strategies that appeal to different modalities (visual, tactile, etc.) need to be consistently integrated into instruction.
- Use of acceleration to bridge gaps within skills groups
- Develop school-wide plan for addressing missed instruction during quarantine/isolation

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our learning gains in ELA and Math showed improvement from the 2019 FSA. Specifically, ELA showed improvement in gains among the general population as well as the bottom quartile, while math gains improved among the general population only.

#### What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

- Regular intensive ELP was hugely beneficial
- ESE services/special curriculum
- RTI back to in class instead of rotating
- Teacher resources that were easily accessible and consistent across setting (on site vs. eLearning)
- MTSS process/data PLC's were focused and useful

### **What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

- Student incentives
- Additional ELP time for bottom quartile students
- Keeping small groups flexible and data-driven
- Involvement of resource teachers (ELL, SWD, Gifted) during planning to aid in differentiation/targeted instruction

### **Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

- Models of lessons/planning that demonstrate concrete examples/practices of acceleration.
- Model of team planning
- Strategies to improve vocabulary acquisition and usage
- Math coaching cycles and PLCs
- Training that supports teaching foundational skills in intermediate
- Wonders trainings
- ELL assistive technology

### **Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

- ELP tutoring for below level students
- Encouraging departmentalized teachers to regroup students among them
- Parent training - STEAM night, curriculum night (by subject and grade), reading night
- VE students receive homework help 1 morning each week
- FSA bootcamps after school
- Discussion/transparency regarding class make-up

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will increase student math learning gains from 60% to 70% by aligning the instruction and instructional tasks to the rigor of the standards with continuous progress monitoring.

**Measurable Outcome:** The goal is that Carrollwood will increase its math learning gains to 70% on the 2021-2022 FSA.

**Monitoring:**

- Monthly PLCs to discuss data from math monthlies
- Analysis of grade level iReady diagnostic data
- Math coaching and observation cycles

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Matthew Testoni (matthew.testoni@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Data meetings to review each common assessment and plan for reteach
- Data meetings to review iReady Diagnostic data and growth
- Classroom observations, coaching, and feedback

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Regular data meetings following each common assessment will help instructional staff identify students' level of standard mastery. That information will be used to effectively differentiate through foundational scaffolding, additional guided practice, or providing opportunities for application/analysis/evaluation/creation.

### Action Steps to Implement

- Common planning among content areas
- Monthly PLCs to analyze common assessments
- Teacher observation of math coach lessons
- Use of grade level pre-assessments to determine greatest areas of need
- Use of manipulatives and tactile strategies
- Evidence of Math Vocabulary, accountable talk
- Visuals Representation of mathematical strategies
- Evidence of differentiated activities that reflect Bloom's Taxonomy
- Exposure to grade level standards
- Evidence of Acceleration

**Person Responsible:** Matthew Testoni (matthew.testoni@hcps.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus** Student achievement will increase in our ELL & SWD subgroups; ELL going from 31% to 41% and SWD 29% to 41% . By building the capacity of PLCs to purposefully plan standards based lessons, differentiation/acceleration to meet the needs of all learners.

**Measurable Outcome:** ELL going from 31% to 41% and SWD 29% to 41%

- Monitoring:**
- Regularly reviewing diagnostic data
  - Analysis of math monthly data
  - Attending district level math PLCs
  - Classroom walk-throughs

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Mary Jo Stover (maryjo.stover@hcps.net)

- Evidence-based Strategy:**
- Differentiation
  - Professional Development
  - Coaching cycles with Content Experts

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Current data (FSA & iReady) showed that these sub-groups were not attaining the required 41% proficiency level as indicated on the ESSA report.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- ELL teacher providing planning support
- PD on ELL resources
- PD on Differentiation Strategies
- Common planning among content areas
- Monthly PLCs to analyze common assessments
- Teacher observation of math coach lessons
- Use of grade level pre-assessments to determine greatest areas of need
- Use of manipulatives and tactile strategies
- Evidence of Math Vocabulary, accountable talk
- Evidence of print rich environment, word wall in use
- Visuals Representation of content
- Evidence of differentiated activities that reflect Bloom's Taxonomy
- Exposure to grade level standards
- Evidence of Acceleration

**Person Responsible** Matthew Testoni (matthew.testoni@hcps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**During the 2019 - 2020 school year, Carrollwood was placed in the "high" category on the state-wide incident ranking report. We placed particularly high in the area of violent incidents. This placement is due our Behavior Support units, of which we have 3. As expected with students enrolled in these programs, these students have several ways that their behaviors are addressed. Not only do they have social emotional goals written into their IEPs, they receive regular counseling to support those goals, and regular supports by district personnel.**

**Regarding the rest of our population, behavior incidents (the majority of which are minor and do not result in documentation of any kind) are supported through our PBIS plan (implemented in 2019-2020), as well as the MTSS system for behavior interventions, resulting in an FBA when necessary. Additionally, our ESE Supervisor chairs a "Mini-Bits" committee, where teachers can seek behavior support strategies for students that show a need that may not be severe enough to warrant outside interventions.**

#### **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.**

Character trait word of the month is presented over the morning show. Teachers are provided lessons that they can incorporate with their students in addition to the school counselor presenting monthly lessons. Mindful Learning Time is incorporated into the daily schedule for teachers to meet with their students at the start of the day. Positive Behavior Intervention Support program is being implemented school wide and grade level teachers meet monthly to review behavior data and to plan for quarterly incentive celebrations. Restorative practice is conducted monthly for a Behavior Support Students and used after a suspension. Students who are having a difficult time emotionally, academically, or socially are provided a Check and Connect mentor.

#### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Veronica Kreisher, Guidance Counselor, PBIS Coordinator - Monthly lessons around positive character traits, Recognition of students that exemplify monthly Character Trait, "Caught Being Good"

PBIS Team - Review of school-wide behaviors/behavioral expectations, plans school-wide behavior incentives/activities

Megan De La Portilla, Social Worker - Mindful Monday presentation on morning show

Testoni/Stover - Acknowledgement of positive behaviors on morning show, Daily OWLS Expectations (PBIS), Character Trait of the Month

**Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>