

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Bing Elementary School



2020-21 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bing Elementary School

6409 36TH AVE S, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Holley

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (60%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bing Elementary School

6409 36TH AVE S, Tampa, FL 33619

[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	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	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 empower students to take ownership of their academic achievement and practice positive character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bing Elementary envisions every child attain unlimited educational possibilities while being a responsible productive and caring citizen.

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
Hill-Anderson, Melanie	Principal	<p>Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff, reviews of teachers' activities, and issuance of directives. ?</p> <p>Administers and develops educational programs for students with mental or physical disabilities. ?</p> <p>Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school. ? Establishes and maintains relationships with colleges, community organizations, and other schools to coordinate educational services. ?</p> <p>Requisitions and allocates supplies, equipment, and instructional material as needed. ?</p> <p>Directs preparation of class schedules, cumulative records, and attendance reports. ?</p> <p>Walks about school building and property to monitor safety and security.</p> <p>Plans and monitors school budget. ?</p> <p>Plans for and directs building maintenance. ?</p> <p>Performs any other duties as assigned.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/9/2020, Cheryl Holley

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.*

3

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**Demographic Data**

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (60%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	57	61	76	67	65	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	18	26	25	18	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	4	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	1	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	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	

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	62	70	76	71	73	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	11	13	12	14	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	3	18	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	62	70	76	71	73	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	11	13	12	14	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	3	18	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	45%	52%	57%	40%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	58%	51%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	58%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	54%	63%	42%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	57%	62%	61%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	46%	51%	59%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	50%	53%	46%	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	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	22%	51%	-29%	55%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	57%	11%	64%	4%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	60%	1%
	2018	25%	54%	-29%	61%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		36%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	28%	52%	-24%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
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	13	20	19	48	67	46					
ELL	41	47	50	69	87	72	42				
BLK	28	37	50	47	70	46	27				
HSP	48	54	55	74	85	83	57				
WHT	51	52		71	78		75				
FRL	43	50	50	66	82	74	52				
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	18	48	47	20	30		17				
ELL	32	46	61	35	44	47	21				
BLK	22	33	42	33	43	36	21				
HSP	38	48	62	42	49	45	30				
WHT	49	40		58	58						
FRL	35	43	53	41	48	38	31				
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	10	44	46	19	56	55	31				
ELL	34	39	50	36	56	64	47				
BLK	25	47	69	32	53	47	22				
HSP	41	47	53	42	61	67	52				
WHT	55	63		57	69	60	58				
FRL	39	50	57	41	61	59	47				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	65
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	60
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.

ESSA group for students with disabilities is at 38% which is below the needed 41%. The focus has been for all students to be instructed on grade level content; however, there are gaps for these students in the content area of reading that makes it challenging for them to access the content effectively.

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

Reading proficiency, learning, gains and bottom quartile for students with disabilities decreased. New teacher to ESE. More focus needed on a balance of grade level and foundational skills for reading.

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.

ELA Achievement - While there was a 9% increase in this area from the previous year, the reading proficiency is still 12% below the state. The gap is evident based on our iReady data which continued

to show deficits with vocabulary and the need for phonics instruction for some students in the intermediate grades.

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

Math Learning gains - 32% increase from the year prior. A experienced new math coach was hired. A scope and sequence was developed based on assessment data. Weekly PLC's, weekly and monthly assessments that drove the instruction were the new actions taken to show this increase.

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

82 students at or below 90% attendance rate

28 students in grades 3 and 4 scored a level 1 in reading on 2018-2019 FSA

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

1. Increase proficiency, learning gains and bottom quartile in reading for our SWD
2. Improve ELA proficiency in grades 3-5
3. Improve attendance
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA group for students with disabilities is at 38% which is below the needed 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	The ESSA group SWD will increase from 38% to 41% for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie Hill-Anderson (melanie.hill-anderson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Phonics based instruction Grade level Expeditionary Learning (vocabulary/comprehension) with small group focus Iready lesson focused on the need of the student both on the computer (45 minutes per week and during MTSS time with the teacher/interventionist at least 3 times per week)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on data needs and research based interventions
Action Steps to Implement	
Daily phonics instruction based on results of iReady diagnostic	
Person Responsible	Mialana Johnson-Dixon (mialana.johnson@hcps.net)
Daily skills block with Expeditionary Learning with a focus on vocabulary and comprehension	
Person Responsible	Mialana Johnson-Dixon (mialana.johnson@hcps.net)
Tailored iReady lesson on computer and through teacher/interventionist based on student need	
Person Responsible	Melanie Hill-Anderson (melanie.hill-anderson@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 45% of our students showed proficiency on 2018-2019 ELA FSA which is an increase of 9% from the year prior, however it is 12% below the state average.

Measurable Outcome: 55% of our students will show proficiency in ELA as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melanie Hill-Anderson (melanie.hill-anderson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Daily Expeditionary Learning instruction for All Block
Informal assessments to determine the teacher effectiveness for the assessed standard
Scope and sequence development based on assessment data

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly grade level planning with reading coaches

Person Responsible Mialana Johnson-Dixon (mialana.johnson@hcps.net)

Weekly feedback provide based on All Block instruction

Person Responsible Mialana Johnson-Dixon (mialana.johnson@hcps.net)

Informal assessment development and progress monitoring during weekly PLC's

Person Responsible Mialana Johnson-Dixon (mialana.johnson@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There are 82 students that are not meeting 90% or higher on attendance.

Measurable Outcome: 90% or more of our students with have an attendance rate of 90% or higher based on the early warning systems data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Danielle Williams (danielle.williams@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS
Ron Clark House System
Leader in Me

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS - More of a focus needs to be on the data of how students are following school-wide expectations
Ron Clark House System - When students have a sense of belonging they are more apt to attend schools because others are counting on them
Leader in Me - Students continue to lack a sense of pride in attending our school.

Action Steps to Implement

Leader in Me - Lighthouse Team Summer Training

Leader in Me Staff training - Aligning Academics

Ron Clark House focused on teachers/staff for semester 1 and students for semester 2

PBIS Team will attend a booster training in July.

Person Responsible Melanie Hill-Anderson (melanie.hill-anderson@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

PBIS
Ron Clark House System
Leader in Me

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: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00