

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Gibson 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 | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Gibsonton Elementary School

7723 GIBSONTON DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Bree Beitelschies

Start Date for this Principal: 4/10/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (38%) |
| 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 | 0 |

Gibsonton Elementary School

7723 GIBSONTON DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[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 | 94% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 67% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | D | 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 all Gibsonton Elementary stakeholders to be global life long learners through high quality academically individualized instruction while instilling core values.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everyone will be successful.

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 |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Guy, Cindy | Principal | |
| | Assistant Principal | |
| Feaster, Emily | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/10/2017, Bree Beitelschies

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.*

2

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (38%) |
| 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 | 55 | 87 | 75 | 87 | 80 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 465 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 33 | 23 | 29 | 33 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 | 10 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 30 | 25 | 31 | 14 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |
| 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 | 26 | 84 | 88 | 91 | 86 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 38 | 28 | 23 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 16 | 37 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

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 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

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 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 26 | 84 | 88 | 91 | 86 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 38 | 28 | 23 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 16 | 37 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

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 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

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 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 33% | 52% | 57% | 43% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | 55% | 58% | 59% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 56% | 50% | 53% | 51% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 45% | 54% | 63% | 43% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 65% | 57% | 62% | 52% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 46% | 51% | 45% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 32% | 50% | 53% | 32% | 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 | 24% | 52% | -28% | 58% | -34% |
| | 2018 | 35% | 53% | -18% | 57% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 36% | 55% | -19% | 58% | -22% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 55% | -24% | 56% | -25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 36% | 54% | -18% | 56% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 51% | -13% | 55% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 42% | 54% | -12% | 62% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 35% | 55% | -20% | 62% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 40% | 57% | -17% | 64% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 57% | -18% | 62% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 48% | 54% | -6% | 60% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 54% | -3% | 61% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 33% | 51% | -18% | 53% | -20% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 33% | 52% | -19% | 55% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 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 | 16 | 46 | 59 | 37 | 56 | 43 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 41 | 44 | 38 | 67 | 55 | 16 | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 27 | | 13 | 18 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | 47 | 52 | 41 | 70 | 57 | 26 | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 63 | | 62 | 68 | | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 52 | 54 | 44 | 64 | 46 | 34 | | | | |
| 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 | 8 | 28 | 39 | 18 | 30 | 28 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 30 | 36 | 29 | 48 | 38 | 7 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 45 | 24 | 32 | | | | |
| WHT | 35 | 34 | 33 | 54 | 57 | 25 | 40 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 38 | 36 | 46 | 48 | 21 | 35 | | | | |
| 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 | 14 | 45 | 33 | 24 | 42 | 35 | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 50 | 42 | 29 | 40 | 50 | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 58 | 52 | 39 | 48 | 52 | 24 | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 61 | 53 | 46 | 57 | 44 | 44 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 59 | 51 | 42 | 51 | 45 | 30 | | | | |

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 | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 384 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 20 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 47 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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.

Proficiency in 3rd grade dropped by 11 percentage points between 2018-2019. Each year approximately 75% of students come into 3rd grade reading below level. We have been unable to increase the number of students reading on level in k-2 using our current curriculum. Students have also struggled with basic number sense in mathematics and this effects their ability to solve problems in the upper grades and retention of mathematics concepts.

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

Proficiency in 3rd grade dropped by 11 percentage points between 2018-2019. Each year approximately 75% of students come into 3rd grade reading below level. We have been unable to increase the number of students reading on level in k-2 using our current curriculum.

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.

Proficiency in 3rd grade dropped by 11 percentage points between 2018-2019. Each year approximately 75% of students come into 3rd grade reading below level. We have been unable to increase the number of students reading on level in k-2 using our current curriculum.

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

Mathematics Lowest 25% learning gain increased by 25 percentage points. These students were identified by name in a central location and a person was assigned to each grade level to "own" those students. Small group instruction was tailored for the specific need of the group and consistently monitored.

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

Attendance: Every grade level is double digits for students under 90% attendance. Range of 19-39 students. 137 out of 484 have less than 90% attendance which is 28% of our school population.

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

1. Increase reading proficiency in grades K-5
2. Increase mathematics proficiency in grades k-5
3. Increase the number of students that have attend school greater than 90% of the time.
4. Increase use of small group differentiation to fill gaps on learning.
5. Increase parent engagement in the school community.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on 18-19 data, 33% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on ELA FSA. SWD subgroup was 40% of available points from FSA which is below the 41% goal. African American students 20% of available points from FSA which is well below the 41% goal. African American students have been below the 41% goal for two years. Students have gaps in learning that teachers must address through differentiation and core instruction. K-2 reading needs to be strengthened before students reach 3rd grade.

Measurable Outcome:

Students proficiency in reading will rise as a result of standards based planning to include core instruction and differentiation through small group intensive instruction. Subgroups of SWD and African American will rise to at least 41% of available points on FSA 20-21

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Institute a systematic plan for standards based planning
2. Deliver quality differentiation through small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

33% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher on ELA FSA. Planning lessons based standards that are engaging and meet the needs of each student ensures that student achievement will rise at all levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1a. Reading coaches will facilitate planning for grades K-5 for 50 minutes 3 times weekly. Planning sessions will focus on the standards to teach, assessment for learning, and data chats to discuss success as well as reteach for mastery. Coaches will reinforce appropriate best practices to increase proficiency and small group instruction to increase mastery.

1b. Coaches and instructional aides will pull small targeted groups for remediation in grades K-5 for 30 minutes sessions, three times per week. Teachers will pull small targeted groups for remediation daily.

1c. Coaches will provide targeted professional development in the areas that are needed to strengthen core and differentiated instruction. One session per quarter with small group sessions as needed.

1d. Teacher leaders will provide small group professional development in exemplar practices as defined by the ILT.

1e. After school enrichment opportunities (clubs) will be utilized to increase student learning time.

1f. SWD and African American subgroups will be included in all remediation groups when deemed non proficient and tracked by monthly assessments for proficiency and learning gains to monitor the progress.

Person

Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on 18-19 data, 45% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on Mathematics FSA. SWD subgroup was 40% of available points from FSA which is below the 41% goal. African American students 20% of available points from FSA which is well below the 41% goal. African American students have been below the 41% goal for two years. Students have gaps in learning that teachers must address through differentiation and core instruction. K-2 mathematics needs to be strengthened before students reach 3rd grade. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Students proficiency in mathematics will rise as a result of standards based planning to include core instruction and differentiation through small group intensive instruction. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institute a systematic plan for standards based planning 2. Deliver quality differentiation through small group instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | 45% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher on Mathematics FSA. Planning lessons based standards that are engaging and meet the needs of each student ensures that student achievement will rise at all levels. |

Action Steps to Implement

- 2a. Math Resource Teachers will facilitate planning for grades K-5 for 50 minutes 3 times weekly. Planning sessions will focus on the standards to teach, assessment for learning, and data chats to discuss success as well as reteach for mastery. Coaches will reinforce appropriate best practices to increase proficiency and small group instruction to increase mastery.
- 2b. Coaches and instructional aides will pull small targeted groups for remediation in grades K-5 for 30 minutes sessions, three times per week. Teachers will pull small targeted groups for remediation daily.
- 2c. Coaches will provide targeted professional development in the areas that are needed to strengthen core and differentiated instruction. One session per quarter with small group sessions as needed.
- 2d. Teacher leaders will provide small group professional development in exemplar practices as defined by the ILT.
- 2e. After school enrichment opportunities (clubs) will be utilized to increase student learning time.
- 2f. SWD and African American subgroups will be included in all remediation groups when deemed non proficient and tracked by monthly assessments for proficiency and learning gains to monitor the progress.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Gibsonton Elementary launched its Community School initiative during the 2019-2020 school year by conducting an intensive needs and assets assessment, The Listening Project. 87% (n=442) of families were engaging in the process to understand their vision for the school, as well as what they collectively view as priorities for problem solving moving forward. Parents expressed a desire to partner with the school to improve student education through communication effort, PTA involvement and parent supports. This area of focus is further supported through SCIP data for the 2019 school year. Volunteering and relationship building was the lowest scoring composite compared to all elementary schools, there is a 3% gap in performance in this area. Only 65% of SCIP respondents indicated that they were aware of the PTA and its role; during 19-20, there were no PTA meeting and only 41 members. Likewise, 78% (compared to 85% of all district elementary schools) indicated that they have an opportunity to participate in school committees.

Measurable Outcome:

Hold monthly parent-led PTA meeting
 Improve parent rating of parent engagement opportunities by 3% each quarter (school created survey administered quarterly with quarter 1 establishing baseline)
 Increase PTA membership by 25% as compared to last years membership (n=41) by the end of 2021 school year.
 Increase parent SCIP Aggregation score from 85% in 19-20 to 90% by the end of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Parent Teacher Home Visit Project
 Structures to support parent engagement, leadership, and decision-making through events and services (ie problem solving teams, PTA, SAC)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Parent Teacher Home Visiting is an evidence-based strategy that produces positive impact to attendance and academic achievement. Studies suggest a 22% decrease in the likelihood of chronic absenteeism and a 35% improved odds of scoring proficient of ELA tests by building authentic and trusting family-school partnerships.

Strategy:

Volunteering and relationship building was Gibsonton's lowest composite score (85%) on the 19-20 parent SCIP survey.

Action Steps to Implement

- 3a. Strategically share information using a variety of modalities regarding upcoming events and opportunities for families as well as meeting minutes and progress updates.
- 3b. Hold monthly parent-led PTA meetings.
- 3c. Train school staff and implement the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project with fidelity.
- 3d. Create and administer parent survey regarding engagement and opportunities on a quarterly basis.
- 3e. Launch a problem-solving team to address parent engagement using Improvement Science methodology.

Person Responsible

Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

na

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.

The community School Project involves all stakeholders in building a strong positive school culture. All stakeholders are surveyed to determine the needs of the community of learners and then problem solving is centered on those needs.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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