

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Town & Country 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Town & Country Elementary School

6025 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Otis Kitchen

Start Date for this Principal: 7/4/2020

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	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 White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Town & Country Elementary School

6025 HANLEY RD, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">93%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">94%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide students with the tools to create their own vision for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student can excel.

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
Kitchen, Otis	Principal	Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff, reviews of teachers' activities, and issuance of directives.
Zamora, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Makes or shares in the making of decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so that actions may be taken and commitments made by self and others.
Calve, Christina	Science Coach	The Science Coach/Resource Teacher will maintain and monitor the implementation of the science program, including professional development of school personnel.
Garcia, Hilary	ELL Compliance Specialist	Maintain and monitor implementation of the program, including train school personnel for classroom teachers, administrators, and guidance counselors to ensure the comprehensible instruction of English language learners,
Reyes, Gina	Other	Collaborate with the school team (teachers and paraprofessionals) to implement best practices of data collection, analysis, inclusive practices, and responsive instructional decisions for students with disabilities. Monitors and supports the efficacy of instruction provided to students with disabilities in general education and ESE settings.
Gentle, Leontrae	Other	Assist in implementing a documentation system to ensure the sufficiency of supplemental (targeted) and intensive interventions in ELA and in Math.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/4/2020, Otis Kitchen

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

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

376

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

2

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

2

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	38	59	58	46	41	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309
Attendance below 90 percent	16	21	16	12	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	9	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	16	20	11	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
	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	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/29/2021

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	64	52	51	56	58	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	330
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	12	8	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
-----------------------------	----	----	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	0
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
--	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	0
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	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	64	52	51	56	58	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	330
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	12	8	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				57%	52%	57%	42%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	55%	58%	41%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	50%	53%	41%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	54%	63%	46%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	57%	62%	64%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	46%	51%	53%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	50%	53%	56%	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	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	51%	1%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used iReady ELA and Math data to progress monitor student achievement data. We used the baseline and mid year assessments to progress monitor science student achievement data.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	31	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	31	54
	Students With Disabilities	14	37	58
	English Language Learners	14	14	35
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	27	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	27	43
	Students With Disabilities	15	33	64
	English Language Learners	11	13	27

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	53	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	54	70
	Students With Disabilities	32	43	58
	English Language Learners	25	44	59
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70	90	96
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	29	59
	Students With Disabilities	12	23	59
	English Language Learners	4	18	44

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57	69	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	71	76
	Students With Disabilities	42	51	54
	English Language Learners	35	56	67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	39	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	37	54
	Students With Disabilities	27	43	56
	English Language Learners	14	25	55

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	52	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	51	56
	Students With Disabilities	40	41	47
	English Language Learners	37	37	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	24	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	24	33
	Students With Disabilities	19	20	28
	English Language Learners	9	18	24

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	59	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	58	64
	Students With Disabilities	54	57	62
	English Language Learners	55	53	56
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	33	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	33	42
	Students With Disabilities	25	26	36
	English Language Learners	13	36	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	38	52	
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	50	
	Students With Disabilities	47	51	
	English Language Learners	38	53	
	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	19	40	30	14	26		20				
ELL	46	50		31	34		38				
BLK	25			25							
HSP	46	41		34	33	20	37				
FRL	42	47	46	32	29	17	37				
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	30	29	32	45	40					
ELL	55	64	44	51	72	60	52				
BLK	25			27							
HSP	58	64	52	54	64	54	61				
WHT	67			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
FRL	55	61	52	53	63	44	54				
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	4	27	31	25	60	58					
ELL	30	40	44	43	65	56	30				
HSP	41	43	42	44	65	48	55				
WHT	33			47	50						
FRL	41	43	44	46	64	56	57				

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	39
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	309
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	42
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	
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	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
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 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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
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?

Students made progress in grades 1-5 in ELA and Math. The student achievement proficient levels for FRL, ESE, Black, and ELL students are significantly lower when compared to all students.

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

Math in particular in all grades demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Spending a significant amount of time providing isolated math remediation to students. We covered many objectives and standards from prior grade levels for extended periods of time. New actions were focused planning and instruction with an emphasis on acceleration. Acceleration connected unfinished learning in context with new learning to provide our students support.

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

ELA in particular in 5th grade demonstrated significant improvement.

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

Effective collaborative team planning and student data analysis with specific action steps.

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

Effective collaborative planning to ensure critical unfinished learning is integrated into the scope and sequence so that students receive support immediately prior to when they need it for success with on grade level standards.

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.

1. Develop a framework for team planning that includes before tasks, during tasks and after tasks in which teachers participate.
2. Conduct coaching cycles with teachers around the development of individual, daily lessons, utilizing the Instructional Routine Handbook and Instructional Delivery templates as a guide.
3. Implement a modified lesson study with grades 4-5 teachers in collaboration with the district math coach.

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

Empowering teachers after they have received extensive professional development on accelerated learning and received continuous walkthrough feedback from administration the time to empower each other through peer-to peer observations.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students in the ELA Bottom Quartile made 46% gains and the Students with Disabilities, Black/African American students, and English Language Learner students subgroups are under the 41% threshold. Students in the Math Bottom Quartile made 17% gains and all of three subgroups are under the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome: Students in the bottom quartile and targeted subgroups (Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, and ELL) will make a 15% gain in proficiency and learning gains on FSA in ELA/Math, and SSA in Science.

Monitoring: Leadership Team will analyze the students in these sub groups weekly to ensure that they are receiving additional support in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Content area resource teachers and coaches will plan individually with teachers to help incorporate evidence-based teaching strategies throughout their lessons. Professional development will be provided to teachers based on current best practices and evidence-based strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This is the most direct avenue to provide support to our teachers which then provides a direct link to student learning

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly planning sessions with content area specialists

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

The District Reading Coach will work with teachers to develop strategies to differentiate instruction for struggling students.

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Science Resource Teacher will work with teachers to develop strategies to differentiate instruction for struggling students.

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

ELL Resource Teacher will work with teachers to develop strategies to differentiate instruction for struggling students.

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

MTSS Resource Teacher will assist in implementing a documentation system to ensure the sufficiency of supplemental (targeted) and intensive interventions in ELA and in Math.

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Provide Professional development in differentiating teaching for struggling learners.

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Leadership Team will analyze the students in the bottom quartile weekly to ensure that they are receiving additional support in the classroom

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our proficiency in ELA in grades 3-5 were 49% in third grade, 31% in four grade, and 50% in fifth grade. We were below the 50% threshold in grades 3 and 4.

Measurable Outcome:

We will be at a minimum 50% proficient in grades 3-5.

Monitoring:

The leadership team will analyze ELA student data weekly to ensure that they are receiving additional support in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Content area district resource teachers and coaches will plan with teachers individually and in grade level teams to help incorporate evidence-based teaching strategies throughout their lessons. Professional development will be provided to teachers based on current best practices and evidence-based strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This is the most direct avenue to provide support to our teachers which then provides a direct link to student learning

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a framework for team planning that includes before tasks, during tasks and after tasks in which teachers participate.

Person Responsible

Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Conduct coaching cycles with teachers around the development of individual, daily lessons, utilizing the Instructional Routine Handbook and Instructional Delivery templates as a guide. Support teachers in the development of standards appropriate anchor charts, graphic organizers and academic language so that the learning target is clear to students and aligns to the work they are doing with the text.

Person Responsible

Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Monitor the accuracy and alignment of the learning target and task through focused administrative walk throughs. Provide feedback to teachers on the learning target and its relationship to the text, delivery model and overall daily task.

Person Responsible

Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Introduce teachers to the Webb's Depths of Knowledge in their weekly planning session. Review the verbs and sample tasks. DRT will model in planning how to build rich questions that can lead to various collaborative structures to promote discussion amongst students. In addition, suggestions for talk moves and sentence frames will be provided.

Person Responsible

Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Add to the planning framework for teachers to come to the weekly planning sessions with suggested higher order discussion questions collaborative structures to be utilized.

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@hcps.net)

Conduct coaching cycles with teachers around the implementation of higher order questions and discussions among students. Support teachers in the development of anchor charts to promote discussions, selecting an appropriate collaborative structure and/or modeling for students how to use accountable talk stems.

Person Responsible Otis Kitchen (otis.kitchen@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.

We reported 0.5 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. This was considered moderate. We will monitor our school climate and culture through the lens of discipline by using systems such as Behavior Tracker and Ed Connect Referrals. We also will use student SEL Panorama data and observe how results correlate to discipline concerns.

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.

Town and Country Elementary builds positive relations with parents through ongoing communication in both English and Spanish. We will hold several events throughout the year that provide support for parents with their child's learning and also to recognize their child's accomplishments. Town and Country Elementary actively pursues business partnerships within our community. After we have established partnerships within our community, we have our partners serve on our School Advisory Council and PTA. Our community partners also mentor students and provide incentives for students and staff.

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

Frameworks of Tampa Bay-Provides support to educators on our campus to empower our students with skills to express their feelings and advocate for themselves.

Berkeley Preparatory School-Collaborative mural project that will provide opportunities for our students to express their creativity as well as take pride in our school..

All Pro Dads- Provides opportunities for our fathers to be involved in decision making at our school and celebrate their child's success.

THJCA – School Community Garden will strengthen ties between our school and community. School gardening programs offer opportunities for community members to get involved as well as beautify our school's physical environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00