

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Doby Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

Doby Elementary School

6720 COVINGTON GARDEN DR, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Fuller

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
2020-21 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 (48%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Doby Elementary School

6720 COVINGTON GARDEN DR, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

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

Doby Navigators will achieve and grow through rigorous instruction and quality resources.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Doby Navigators lead and achieve by being caring, cooperative, and courageous.

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
Rush, Rosanne	Principal	<p>The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meets regularly (2x/month) to review current data and brainstorm best practice strategies to increase student performance. The purpose of the ILT is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve the fidelity of high quality instructional practices 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention (Tier 2/3) levels 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goals 4. Support the implementation of small group and differentiated instruction 5. Communicate school-wide data to PLC's and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams <p>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through ILT meetings and PLC's. Research consistently shows that the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and remain at, a school site is the administration. HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Principal Pipeline. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students.</p> <p>HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the researched based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers.</p>
Simons, Denisha	Instructional Coach	<p>As SAC chair, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Plan all agendas -Facilitate monthly meeting -Review and disseminate student data -Communicate with community member to encourage participation <p>As a TTD, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Attending 2x/month ILT meetings -Review student data -Problem solve solutions for student success -Facilitate grade level planning sessions -Provide coaching support to teachers
Ervin, Renee-Marie	Assistant Principal	<p>As Assistant Principal of Elementary Instruction, communicating best practices in teaching is imperative to teacher success and student achievement. Responsibilities include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve the fidelity of high quality instructional

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>practices</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention (Tier 2/3) levels 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goals 4. Support the implementation of small group and differentiated instruction 5. Communicate school-wide data to PLC's and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams 6. Conduct high quality walkthroughs and observations and provide immediate & actionable feedback.
Page, Erica	Teacher, K-12	<p>As a member of ILT, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates team planning -Facilitates PLC's to share information and data from ILT -Supports grade level teachers -Ensures that high level instruction meets the needs of all learners -Participates in 2x/month ILT meetings to discuss students data
Olmo, Cheyenne	Teacher, K-12	<p>As a member of ILT, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates team planning -Facilitates PLC's to share information and data from ILT -Supports grade level teachers -Ensures that high level instruction meets the needs of all learners -Participates in 2x/month ILT meetings to discuss students data
Zhou, Mallori	Teacher, K-12	<p>As a member of ILT, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates team planning -Facilitates PLC's to share information and data from ILT -Supports grade level teachers -Ensures that high level instruction meets the needs of all learners -Participates in 2x/month ILT meetings to discuss students data
Olivares-Weiner, Lourdes	Teacher, K-12	<p>As a member of ILT, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates team planning -Facilitates PLC's to share information and data from ILT -Supports grade level teachers -Ensures that high level instruction meets the needs of all learners -Participates in 2x/month ILT meetings to discuss students data
Hernandez, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	<p>As a member of ILT, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates team planning -Facilitates PLC's to share information and data from ILT -Supports grade level teachers -Ensures that high level instruction meets the needs of all learners -Participates in 2x/month ILT meetings to discuss students data

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Innocenti, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	<p>As a member of ILT, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates team planning -Facilitates PLC's to share information and data from ILT -Supports grade level teachers -Ensures that high level instruction meets the needs of all learners -Participates in 2x/month ILT meetings to discuss students data
Wilson, Joanie	Teacher, ESE	<p>As a member of ILT, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates PLC's to share information and data from ILT -Supports grade level teachers with ESE strategies -Ensures that high level instruction meets the needs of all learners -Participates in 2x/month ILT meetings to discuss students data -Specially supports teachers with SWD in providing them with differentiated instruction to meet students needs.
Hoops, Sabrina	Instructional Coach	<p>As a TTD, responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Attending 2x/month ILT meetings -Review student data -Problem solve solutions for student success -Facilitate grade level planning sessions -Provide coaching support to teachers

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Bradley Fuller

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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

7

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

7

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	110	102	124	139	94	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	679
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	12	25	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	92	111	118	110	104	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	639
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	13	13	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	22	72	35	45	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
Course failure in Math	1	5	19	20	17	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	3	4	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	100	113	123	111	109	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	668
Attendance below 90 percent	6	11	12	13	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	7	14	10	21	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	5	18	14	20	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	6	11	10	20	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	2	1	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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 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				62%	52%	57%	64%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	55%	58%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	50%	53%	39%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	54%	63%	64%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	57%	62%	63%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	46%	51%	57%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	50%	53%	62%	51%	55%

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	70%	52%	18%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For K-5 Reading & Math, we used I-Ready for progress monitoring data. For 5th grade Science, we used the district BOY & Mid year data, as well as the SSA.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24%	31%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	42%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	50%	60%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	27%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	42%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	80%	0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40%	42%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	67%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	12%	12%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25%	20%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	40%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	12%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	34%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	22%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	7%	13%
	English Language Learners	10%	8%	9%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21%	11%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	11%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	10%	0%	0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43%	31%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	60%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	18%	18%
	English Language Learners	77%	33%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%	6%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	22%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	11%	0%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35%	23%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	33%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	18%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28%	13%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	48%	57%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	12	27	29	19	38	25	12				
ELL	32			25							
BLK	44	53		35	40		40				
HSP	43	11		31	44		45				
MUL	53			47							
WHT	61	63		60	71		64				
FRL	45	50	42	36	49	20	43				
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	26	23	15	26	44	44	19				
ELL	47	46	18	42	36	40	23				
BLK	56	48	50	42	32		43				
HSP	55	47	21	46	44	29	34				
MUL	52	50		47	50		67				
WHT	69	53	26	64	63	63	59				
FRL	55	49	28	42	46	33	41				
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	34	37	33	58	67	25				
ELL	58	39	18	67	70						
ASN	70			100							
BLK	54	45	33	46	55	64	33				
HSP	52	43	32	55	57	52	56				
MUL	79	53		64	58						
WHT	72	58	67	72	67	58	72				
FRL	57	46	33	50	54	52	55				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	89%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	64
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	43
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?

The bottom quartile for Math showed the lowest performance, with only 20% of all 3rd-5th graders demonstrating proficiency on the 2021 FSA. In our SWD subgroup, only 20% of students were proficient. Our ELL subgroup showed 4% proficiency in Math.

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

The bottom quartile for Math showed the greatest decline from the 2019 FSA data. We had a 19% decline in this area.

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

Our teachers are more effective in teaching core instruction than differentiating for the needs of diverse learners.

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

Our greatest increase was in Math gains based upon the 2019 & 2021 FSA data. We increased 6%.

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

Some support in Math was provided by a District Resource teacher who was able to lesson plan, model lessons, and provide some PD. A continuous push for highly effective Math instruction also contributed to these gains. Additionally, there was increased usage of district provided resources.

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

Teachers will need to continue providing highly effective Math instruction, while utilizing district resources. The District Math Resource teacher has increased her time at Doby, which hopefully will enable more teachers to improve their quality of 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.

Both the DRT and site based Math leaders will be offering voluntary opportunities for teachers to improve practice.

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

This year, we were given a TTD unit. The site based TTD's will be observing, collecting data, providing high quality feedback, and coaching our teachers in order to increase effectiveness.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus	We will plan and deliver strategic instruction to meet individual, specific student needs in order to increase student achievement. This was identified as a critical need based upon FSA data from 2019 & 2021.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase the proficiency rate in all content areas by 20%. Additionally, we would like to see 100% of our students demonstrate learning gains in Math & ELA.
Monitoring:	We will be progress monitoring student achievement and growth through I-Ready diagnostics in Math & Reading, Math Monthlies, and ELA mini assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sabrina Hoops (sabrina.hoops@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers will be providing small group instruction in Math & ELA on a daily basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research based evidence shows that small group instruction provide opportunities to differentiate learning for all students. This allows the teacher to accelerate learning based upon students' individual needs. Differentiated tasks and small group instruction is pivotal in increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

- *Teachers will incorporate district approved technology to support struggling learners.
- *Teachers will utilize district resource teachers as support with planning sessions, PD, and PLC's.
- *Administration will conduct frequent walkthroughs to ensure that small group & differentiation is present in every classroom.

Person Responsible Renee-Marie Ervin (renee-marie.ervin@hcps.net)

- *High quality feedback will be provided following walkthroughs.
- *TTD support for all teachers.

Person Responsible Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will use collaborative planning structures to support the design and implementation of strategic, standards-based instruction. Plans will include differentiation and scaffolding to support diverse learners, including SWD, with grade level content and acceleration with unfinished learning. A strong focus will be placed on ELA in order to support students who have not yet met grade level proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to increase the proficiency rate in ELA and Math to 70%. Additionally, we would like to see 100% of our students demonstrate learning gains.

Monitoring: A member of the leadership team will participate in collaborative team planning sessions in each grade level three times per month..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning will increase teacher effectiveness and resource knowledge which will in turn increase the students' academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that collaborative planning improves student achievement by promoting discussion around curriculum, instruction, student data, and professional development. Doby's decline in proficiency and learning gains across the content areas, as well as the proficiency of SWD, indicate a strong need for higher quality instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide adequate time for collaborative planning among teachers.
Frequent walkthroughs by administration, followed by high quality feedback.
Admin & TTD's will attend planning sessions and provide additional support.
Teachers will plan for and implement select literacy scaffolds in all classes and content areas, which may include text coding, activating prior knowledge, collaborative conversations, and building background knowledge.

Person Responsible Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)

Utilize district support in Math & Science for collaborative planning structures.
Capitalize on the expertise of teacher leaders with a strong reading background.
Use of Imagine Learning for ELL's to strengthen fluency.

Person Responsible Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will utilize the accelerated learning model to increase the learning gains of our bottom quartile students in ELA and Math, specifically focused on our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of our bottom-quartile students will demonstrate learning gains in Math and ELA.
Monitoring:	<p>*A member of the leadership team will participate in collaborative team planning sessions in each grade level twice monthly.</p> <p>*Review of ongoing data on a monthly basis, such as I-Ready, Math Monthlies, and PMA's, to ensure that our SWD's are demonstrating growth.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students have unfinished learning from previous years. The Acceleration model will bridge the gap between the unfinished learning and current core, on grade-level content, skills, and standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools that use an Acceleration model achieve greater learning gains as compared to schools that use a traditional remedial approach.

Action Steps to Implement

During collaborative planning sessions, teachers will access district resources marked for accelerated learning. Informal data will be utilized when planning, as well as choosing appropriate instructional resources.

Differentiated instruction will be carefully planned based upon student needs.

Person Responsible	Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

The leadership team will create year-at-a-glance calendars that include information to assist teachers when planning accelerated instruction.

Person Responsible	Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	We will plan and deliver strategic instruction to meet individual, specific student needs in order to increase student achievement. This was identified as a critical need based upon FSA data from 2019 & 2021.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase the proficiency rate in ELA by 20%. Additionally, we would like to see 100% of our students demonstrate learning gains in ELA.
Monitoring:	We will be progress monitoring student achievement and growth through I-Ready diagnostics Reading, ELA mini assessments, and Spring 2022 FSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee-Marie Ervin (renee-marie.ervin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers will be providing small group instruction in ELA on a daily basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research based evidence shows that small group instruction provide opportunities to differentiate learning for all students. This allows the teacher to accelerate learning based upon students' individual needs. Differentiated tasks and small group instruction is pivotal in increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

- *Teachers will incorporate district approved technology to support struggling learners.
- *Teachers will utilize district resource teachers as support with planning sessions, PD, and PLC's.
- *Administration will conduct frequent walkthroughs to ensure that small group & differentiation is present in every classroom.

Person Responsible Rosanne Rush (rosanne.rush@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.

Our discipline data shows that Doby has a low discipline rate across the grade levels. Rather than using a form a discipline, our staff relies on Restorative Practices techniques, as well as the 7 mindsets for children. Research shows that a responsive classroom approach make the academic environment more engaging, improves classroom management, and creates a climate of classroom community in which students feel safe to take the risks necessary for learning.

In order to merge academic, social, and emotional learning, we will continue to utilize our Restorative practices "circle" (Morning Meeting) strategies, and a school wide behavior system, which encourages students and rewards them for good behavior.

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.

We utilize a variety of resources and best practices to promote positive culture and environment. Through the use of Restorative Practices, Morning Meetings, and 7 Mindsets, we are able to nurture and grow our students both academically and emotionally. We also have a School Wide Behavior Plan, which includes the use of "Doby Dollars" to encourage appropriate behavior in school.

For the staff, we have created a "Wellness Room". It is an adult only space that can be used for staff to relax for a few minutes, unwind, and have a cup of coffee/tea.

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

Rosanne Rush
Camie Hong
Stephanie McDonnell
Sarah Guggenmos
Kim Gonzalez
Sabrina Hoops

Together, we encourage a school wide positive culture and environment by acting as role models, building upon the many incentives we have put into place.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00