

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Thompson Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Thompson Elementary

2020 E SHELL POINT RD, Ruskin, FL 33570

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Casey O'brienswope

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (44%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (39%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Thompson Elementary

2020 E SHELL POINT RD, Ruskin, FL 33570

[no web address on file]

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 KG-5	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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.

To provide an education and support that enables each student to excel as a successful and responsible learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Developing "TRAILBLAZERS" who will be successful in 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
Astacio, Milady	Principal	Uphold district and state educational policies. Create high expectations and support state benchmarks for students and teachers and track progress towards those goals. Develop programs that develop teacher performance. Provides guidance to make the school a better place. Regularly responds to concerns from parents and meets with community leaders.
Cartwright, Autumn	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Math Science Teacher and SAC Chair
O'Brienswope, Casey	Assistant Principal	Uphold district and state educational policies. Create high expectations and support state benchmarks for students and teachers and track progress towards those goals. Develop programs that develop teacher performance. Provides guidance to make the school a better place. Regularly responds to concerns from parents and meets with community leaders.
Saffold, Lana	Instructional Coach	Math Coach- Conduct PLC Planning and Data Sessions with teachers. Develop the necessary professional development trainings for Thompson teachers and present them. Coordinate with Academic support coach for any necessary district trainings to be presented. Provide Coaching cycles for teachers Modeling sessions for teachers
Smith, AngelaC	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair Provide Services to the gifted students

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Casey O'brienswope

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

716

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

6

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

6

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	116	118	107	139	107	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	47	65	54	51	41	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	313
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	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	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	9	2	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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

Friday 8/13/2021

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	100	87	113	115	108	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	31	22	36	24	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
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	9	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	38	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	2	5	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	87	113	115	108	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	31	22	36	24	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
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	9	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	38	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	2	5	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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				42%	52%	57%	34%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	55%	58%	42%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	50%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				36%	54%	63%	37%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				39%	57%	62%	48%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	46%	51%	34%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				37%	50%	53%	30%	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	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	26%	57%	-31%	64%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	51%	-15%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Student progress was monitored using iReady Diagnostics throughout the school year. This included the Fall, Winter and Spring Diagnostic.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	29%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	54%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24%	16%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	36%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16%	23%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49%	58%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	43%	43%
	English Language Learners	57%	36%	71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2%	16%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	42%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	21%
	English Language Learners	18%	35%	47%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34%	34%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	59%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	73%	60%
	English Language Learners	57%	36%	71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	16%	16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	33%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	47%	56%
	English Language Learners	57%	36%	71%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	62%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60%	67%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	51%	57%	73%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47%	67%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	38%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	34%	39%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34%	30%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	62%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	57%	59%	68%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10%	12%	18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	43%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	39%	53%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	19%	9%	na
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	45%	na
	Students With Disabilities	26%	28%	na
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	15	19	16	18	15	11	10				
ELL	37	43	19	42	38	14	34				
BLK	36	54		34	44		36				
HSP	42	42	11	46	40		36				
WHT	42	50		46	50		55				
FRL	38	45	15	42	40	12	38				
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	9	45	50	19	39	33	5				
ELL	32	50	46	27	37	45	17				
BLK	49	68	70	44	36	60	41				
HSP	35	50	50	28	33	38	24				
WHT	56	61		53	61		76				
FRL	38	55	52	34	38	43	32				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	38	33	18	36	40	14				
ELL	23	35	46	25	36	26	18				
BLK	36	36	46	40	51	31	24				
HSP	29	44	47	29	43	29	26				
WHT	46	47	30	56	60	60	50				
FRL	31	40	44	35	45	31	27				

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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
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	33
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	41
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	32
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	49
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	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

A trend that appears is that our grade levels are below the district percentage for proficiency in ELA and Math. The SWD, ELL, and Hispanic subgroups are struggling to make proficiency and gains within ELA and Math.

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

The bottom quartile in ELA and Math demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Due to the CoVid 19, unfinished learning increased and gaps in learning needed to be closed, skills taught, reinforced and applied. The utilization of differentiated instruction was not a primary focus while creating lessons. The bottom quartile of ELA students declined by 33 percent. The bottom quartile of Math declined by 24 percent.

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

This past year, some of the bottom quartile students were e-learners. Students did not log in to their small groups to get extra support. This year, we look forward to working with these students in small groups on a daily basis. Students will receive tailored differentiated instruction and activities in these small groups. These students will also be provided opportunities to attend after-school learning programs to assist with their unfinished learning.

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

The most improvement can be found in Math proficiency, with an increase from 36% proficient to 42 percent proficient. Fourth-grade proficiency increased from 26% to 44% and 5th grade Math

proficiency increased from 36 percent to 42 percent. Science proficiency also increased from 37% to 40%.

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

Teachers came to PLCs and planning sessions twice a week. Coaches modeled, planned, and review data to make the necessary instructional adjustments. Teachers were responsible for analyzing their data and finding trends, identifying students' misconceptions, and developing a prioritized standard plan. This plan would address students' needs and what activities they would work on in small groups with the teacher.

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

Teams will plan collaboratively with instructional coaches to plan for accelerated learning. Teachers will accelerate the critical standards within their grade levels to assist with unfinished learning. Teachers will analyze the iReady Profile grouping report to identify the areas of unfinished learning to address.

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.

If teachers have not had the iReady data training, they will need this PD. Teachers will get clarity through the professional development on data. They will learn how to access, read, interpret and identify the necessary instructional adjustments they will need to make for their students.

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

This year and years to follow, instructional coaches will provide the necessary support and guidance to ensure that each child will have their own individualized accelerated learning plan.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will be equipped to engage all learners through differentiated instruction. So that students can receive tailored instruction around standards.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA, Math and Science proficiency and gains will increase by 5 percentage points while ELA and Math Bottom quartile will increase by 10 percentage points during the 2021- 2022 school year.
Monitoring:	Weekly Planning Sessions, coaching and modeling, providing feedback, data analysis, professional development with Content-specific Instructional coaches to include substitutes for teacher coverage. Math Resource Teachers will be responsible for providing data-driven, small group instruction to targeted students to improve their academic proficiency as needed. The Reading Coach and Response to Intervention Resource will be expected to maintain and monitor the implementation of the district's K-12 reading program, including developing classroom teachers in order to improve reading instruction and acquisition. Throughout the school year, Reading Coaches focus on enhancing teachers' literacy instruction through job-embedded professional development (PD) and coaching. Reading coaches provide support through collaborative standards-based lesson-planning, the modeling of best practices in reading instruction, classroom-based demonstrations, and reflective teaching. They assist teachers in disaggregating data for interpretation and planning for instruction. The Math Resource Teachers assist teachers in planning for and implementing standards-based instruction and assessment, providing just-in-time, job-embedded coaching utilizing a strong knowledge base of mathematics content and pedagogy. Math Resource Teachers conduct PD for classroom teachers and school leadership regarding instructional strategies, best practices, use of materials, and effective teaching techniques.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be actively participating in weekly grade-level professional learning communities with instructional coaches and administrators focused on differentiation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our PLCs will provide opportunities for teachers to increase their capacity in creating differentiated activities based on their student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Small group math/reading rotations to include additional paras for instruction, supplemental materials, and common assessments. The school will braid TSSSA and other funds Title One to hire paraprofessionals who will support academic instruction in 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade classrooms. These paraprofessionals will work directly with students to support guided practice in reading and math.

Person Responsible Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

1.Establish a calendar with Team Planning days and times. This planning will be with the resource or the Coach.

2. Set up a schedule for coaching cycles.
3. Conduct weekly walkthroughs and provide feedback.
4. Hold DATA PLCs that analyze math monthly data, iready data, etc.
5. Schedule and deliver professional development with Content-specific Instructional coaches on differentiation and planning with differentiation in mind.

Person Responsible Lana Saffold (lana.saffold@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To build a strong culture of communication that supports and includes parents in our efforts to increase student engagement and achievement.

Measurable Outcome: There will be a 5 percent decrease among the students who exhibit 2 or more early warning sign indicators during the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: Administration will pull the ABC data biweekly to analyze needs and monitor trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Casey O'Brienswope (casey.obrienswope@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: To implement PBIS and CHAMPS schoolwide to promote intrinsic rewards among students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To improve the instructional practices, work environment, build a school-wide culture of mutual respect and support, and student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff develop and implement Tier 1 Expectations & Rules that are taught to all students and staff
2. A reward system is developed and taught to students and staff to encourage and model appropriate behavior

Person Responsible Casey O'Brienswope (casey.obrienswope@hcps.net)

3. A discipline referral process is developed and implemented consistently
4. Effective consequences are developed and used to address inappropriate behavior
5. Data is used to track progress and identify target areas for intervention
6. Quarterly PBIS celebrations

Person Responsible Casey O'Brienswope (casey.obrienswope@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers will be equipped to engage all learners through differentiated instruction. So that students can received tailored instruction, questioning and tailored tasks around standards.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is for Hispanic, ELL, and SWD groups to reach a minimum of 41% in proficiency in all content areas during the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: This are will be monitored through the weekly PLC sessions and Planning sessions with instructional coaches. During these sessions, the focus will be on tailoring lessons, tasks and activities to meet the needs of all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will be actively participating in weekly grade level professional learning communities with instructional coaches and administrators focused on differentiation. As well as an afternoon planning session with the coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PLC's, additional planning sessions and book studies will provide opportunities for teachers to increase their capacity in creating differentiated activities based on their students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.Establish a calendar with Team Planning days and times. This planning will be with the resource or the Coach.
2. Set up a schedule for coaching cycles.
3. Conduct weekly walkthroughs and provide feedback.
4. Hold DATA PLCs that analyze math monthly data, iredy data, etc.
5. Schedule and deliver professional development with Content-specific Instructional coaches on differentiation and planning with differentiation in mind. PD on Scaffolding and Sentence Frames to support ESE and ELL Learners.

Person Responsible Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will be equipped to engage all learners through scaffolded instruction, so that reading deficiencies are addressed and learning gains increase.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency and gains will increase by 5 percentage points while ELA Bottom quartile will increase by 10 percentage points during the 2021- 2022 school year.
Monitoring:	The Areas of Focus will be monitored through monthly Progress Monitoring Assessments, monthly Achieve3000 Lexile adjustments and the Fall, Winter and Spring I-Ready Diagnostic results. Once data is available, teachers will meet with coaches to analyze data and make instructional decisions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will plan for differentiation and scaffolding to support their diverse learners with grade-level content and acceleration of unfinished learning (Instructional Frameworks).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our bottom quartile students proficiency is currently 21% in ELA. The total ELA proficiency last year was 41%. These students need daily, scaffolded supports in order to maximize learning and close the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend common planning sessions by grade level/content area every week. Planning will be data driven and include the development of small groups based on data. In the teacher-led small groups, teachers will plan for the use of pre-identified literacy scaffolds to accelerate identified unfinished learning.

Person Responsible Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

During planning, ELA and ESOL teachers will identify at least one scaffold/strategy for English Language Learners (ELLs) and embed it in their daily lessons. The following strategies have been recommended by the coaches and ESOL Resource Teacher (DRT): ELlevation strategies, sentence stems for speaking and writing, anchor charts with visuals, and vocabulary development strategies such as content glossaries and word maps.

Person Responsible Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@hcps.net)

Teachers will plan for and implement select literacy scaffolds in all classes and content areas. The four school-wide literacy scaffolds include think marks, activating prior knowledge, collaborative conversations, and building background knowledge. These will be modeled and monitored by the literacy team.

Person Responsible Milady Astacio (milady.astacio@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.

THOMPSON ELEMENTARY-0125 reported 0.7 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students.

Primary Area of concern: Drug/Public Order Incidents

2019-2020 Rating: High

A drug/public order incident rate per 100 students of 0.13

1 drug/public order incidents / 751 students

Statewide rate range: 0 - 2.48

We will conduct ongoing lesson's with Intermediate students regarding drug awareness. This will include whole school participation in Red Ribbon Week.

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.

The school works at building positive relationships with families and community stakeholders. We offer academic and social events to encourage parental participation and input throughout the year. Student progress is communicated via quarterly progress alerts and parent-teacher conferences.

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

Administration will oversee that PBIS and Champs are implemented throughout the school year. Social Services: Guidance, Social Worker and Psychologist and the PBIS Committee will ensure that PBIS Events are scheduled to reward positive behaviors every quarter. Our AP, will give shout outs every Friday, on the morning show for Positive Behavior Referrals. Teachers will implement Class Dojo to tack the amount of points a student earns each quarter. These points will be utilized to go to PBIS Events. Teachers and Staff will continue to support and assist with implementing Thompsons ROPE Rules.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00