

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Ballast Point Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Ballast Point Elementary School

2802 W BALLAST POINT BLVD, Tampa, FL 33611

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Ann Marie Russo Gonzalez**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/12/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

## Ballast Point Elementary School

2802 W BALLAST POINT BLVD, Tampa, FL 33611

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	27%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Building  
Unstoppable  
Lifelong intrinsic  
Learners  
Differentiating for  
Our  
Growing  
Students of the world

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

Preparing Students for Life

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hastings, Beth	Principal	
King, Telia	SAC Member	SAC Chair

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 1/12/2016, Ann Marie Russo Gonzalez

**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.*

32

**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.*

4

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

41

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	78	71	86	91	74	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	3	5	2	3	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	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	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

#### Prior Year - As Reported

#### The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	91	96	84	78	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	490
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	4	8	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

#### 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	1	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	2	2	1	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Prior Year - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	80	86	95	85	69	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	4	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	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	0	2	1	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	73%	52%	57%	69%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	55%	58%	65%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	50%	53%	44%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	54%	63%	77%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	57%	62%	69%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	46%	51%	45%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	50%	53%	65%	48%	51%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE:** This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
	2018	78%	53%	25%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
	2018	75%	55%	20%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
	2018	79%	55%	24%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	57%	27%	64%	20%
	2018	79%	57%	22%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	75%	54%	21%	60%	15%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	51%	20%	53%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	52%	21%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	50	38	35	54	47	44				
BLK	24	20		35	50						
HSP	51	55		60	72	58	61				
MUL	79	79		83	86						
WHT	87	77	46	83	81	70	86				
FRL	47	43	20	54	64	44	56				
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	29	33	45	43	33	36				
BLK	27			25							
HSP	72	67	50	67	57		63				
MUL	80	55		75	64						
WHT	81	57	43	87	85	67	79				
FRL	64	55	50	62	68	44	55				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	33	42	52	67						
ELL	43	45		64	73						
BLK	50	60		50	50						
HSP	63	61		71	65						
MUL	63			63							
WHT	76	72	67	83	74	42	70				
FRL	56	61	37	62	56	32	56				

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Due to COVID closures, Ballast Point did not participate in statewide testing. After reviewing the data from 18-19 school year, it was determined that our ELA bottom quartile Learning Gains were our lowest performance area. Ballast Point dropped 11% in 2019, the students that fell into this group are two grade levels below and receive ESE support on a daily basis. The writing scores were also low for this group of students which contributed to the overall decline in their scores.

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

Due to COVID closures, Ballast Point did not participate in statewide testing. After reviewing the data from 18-19 school year, it was determined that our ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains had our greatest decline. Ballast Point dropped 11% in 2019, the students that fell into this group are two grade levels below and receive ESE support on a daily basis. The writing scores were also low for this group of students which contributed to the overall decline in their scores.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Due to COVID closures, Ballast Point did not participate in statewide testing. After reviewing the data from 18-19 school year, it was determined that our ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains had our greatest decline. Ballast Point dropped 11% in 2019, the students that fell into this group are two grade levels below and receive ESE support on a daily basis. The writing scores were also low for this group of students which contributed to the overall decline in their scores.

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

Due to COVID closures, Ballast Point did not participate in statewide testing. After reviewing the data from 18-19 school year, it was determined that our Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains showed the most improvement. We focused on "Capital Learning Targets" and Teacher/Student Clarity. We also had I-Ready Club before and after school and ELP (Extended Learning Program) prior to the FSA window.

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

Students with Disabilities  
Black Subgroup

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

1. ELA Bottom Quartile
2. 3rd, 4th & 5th Grade Black Students
3. 3rd, 4th & 5th Grade ESE Students
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Currently labeled a TS&I school based on our Black students- Federal Percent Index from 2019 - Data showed that our Black subgroup was 32%.
---	--

<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our goal is to increase student achievement in our Black Subgroup by 10%.
----------------------------	---

<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Beth Hastings (beth.hastings@hcps.net)
---	--

<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	I-Ready Club - small groups will be pulled to focus on individual/group skills ELP Writing Conferences
-------------------------------------	--

<b>Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:</b>	I-Ready - students will be invited to I-Ready Club based on previous years FSA scores and current I-Ready Diagnostic ELP - will begin during the 2nd nine weeks with a focus on our students in the bottom quartile and subgroups. Writing Conferences - will be done in the classroom with the teacher to help each individual students master grade level writing standards.
--	---

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administration will meet with each Bottom Quartile/Black subgroup family to ensure they understand the importance of their child's current academic progress.
2. Grade level collaboration meetings bi-weekly to discuss student progress and plan for additional interventions.
3. Provide professional development for staff in the area of Writing.
4. Non-Evaluative Walkthroughs with Feedback and Fidelity Checks
5. I-Ready Club for students
6. Extended Learning Program - 2nd Nine Weeks

<b>Person Responsible</b>	Beth Hastings (beth.hastings@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**This year Ballast Point will continue to work with the Peter J Mulry Foundation and Truist Bank to provide Mentors that will work with our At-Risk students. They will focus on our Life Skills as well as Academic Support.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**



A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Ballast Point has multiple ways to reach out and involve all stakeholders. Some of the activities include - Chat with the Principal (one per grade level), Mentoring with Peter J. Mulry Foundation & Truist Bank, monthly newsletters, and weekly emails.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

### **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>