Lake Magdalene Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Magdalene Elementary School

2002 PINE LAKE DR, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ann Perez   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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

Lake Magdalene Elementary School

2002 PINE LAKE DR, Tampa, FL 33612

[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	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	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.

Lake Magdalene will provide a safe, dynamic environment that promotes innovation and accountability.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Lake Magdalene 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	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Perez, Ann	Principal	The Principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary, adult, ESE or other specialized public school sites. The Principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Sierra, Mandy	Teacher, K-12	The Site Resource Teacher is responsible for overseeing implementation of key strategies and/or systems within the school environment. The Site Resource Teacher provides professional development for staff, supports administrative functions, models lessons, works collaboratively with both instructional staff and administration ensuring model teaching practices are provided to all stakeholders. Additionally, the Site Resource Teachers provides timely and currently accepted best practices to staff on how to move instruction forward.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ann Perez

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
48

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 (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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	107	117	100	129	118	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	693
Attendance below 90 percent	9	9	8	11	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	132	113	134	119	119	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	733
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	14	11	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	38	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	38	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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

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

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	4	17	10	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
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	132	113	134	119	119	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	733
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	14	11	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	38	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	38	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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

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

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	4	17	10	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
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	55%	52%	57%	55%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	48%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	37%	51%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	64%	54%	63%	51%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	46%	51%	37%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	50%	53%	55%	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	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	54%	11%	62%	3%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	57%	3%	64%	-4%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	60%	-1%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	61%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
	2018	54%	52%	2%	55%	-1%
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	20	44	48	28	33	20	11				
ELL	31	50	38	48	48	29	13				
BLK	33	41	58	38	41	25	35				
HSP	52	50	49	58	50	31	41				
MUL	53			79							
WHT	65	55	50	77	61	27	81				
FRL	46	48	52	57	49	26	48				
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	9	31	38	17	37	28	7				
ELL	29	50	44	44	61	44					
BLK	23	33	25	35	47	25	26				
HSP	52	44	41	62	54	27	59				
MUL	59	60		71	80						
WHT	63	50	48	71	75	35	64				
FRL	46	44	41	56	56	28	41				
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	12	26	29	12	25	19	17				
ELL	12	25	27	30	57	63	20				
BLK	36	37		26	21	9	42				
HSP	47	45	35	44	58	55	48				
MUL	58	42		63	89						
WHT	67	54	32	63	50	14	67				

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
FRL	43	39	33	40	47	40	42				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	39
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	50
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	66
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	59
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	49
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Bottom Quartile for Math.
Teachers were not effectively differentiating instruction based on data. Due to COVID, students were unable to take FSA so any progress toward the goal was not measured.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year is math learning gains. The factors that contributed to this low performance were lack of resources available for teachers, planning that was not collaborative, and minimal differentiated instruction.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Mathematics learning gains of the bottom quartile. Lack of data driven instruction, Response to Interventions, lack of resources, and differentiation were what contributed to this gap.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was English Language Arts Bottom Quartile. The teachers and resource staff collaboratively planned weekly and based instruction and skill building based on student data.

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

Our areas of concern are student attendance below 90 percent, and level 1 on FSA. These two areas may be related; if students aren't in school they cannot gain the skills needed to score higher on FSA.

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

1. Learning gains in Math.
2. Learning gains for Math Bottom Quartile
3. Proficiency on I-Ready Reading and Math.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning gains for math went down by 11 points from the 2017-2018 FSA data, while bottom quartile gains did not improve at all. Lake Magdalene will improve this by creating high expectations and differentiated instruction for student achievement and the students and staff will improve the culture, teaching, and learning. Due to COVID, students were unable to take FSA during the 2019-2020 school year. Based on the I-Ready Fall Diagnostic, reading and math proficiency are areas of focus this year.
Measurable Outcome:	The school will improve learning gains for all ELA and Math by 10 points as measured on FSA. The school will also improve ELA and Math proficiency to 50% for all 3-5 students on the I-Ready Spring Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ann Perez (ann.perez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use data to differentiate instruction through collaborative planning, use resources, drive their instruction, and create high expectations for student achievement school-wide using CHAMPS.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The school is implementing these strategies because with differentiated instruction, collaborative planning, and high expectations, the students and staff can improve learning as measured on the FSA and the I-Ready Assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Classroom walkthroughs to monitor differentiated instruction.
2. Weekly scheduled i-Ready and Flocabulary student computer time to increase proficiency.
3. Weekly collaborative planning.
4. School wide expectations/procedures.
5. Monitoring of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black/African American student progress based on ESSA.
6. Professional development based on school wide needs.
7. Students will utilize Reflex Math to improve their math fluency.
8. Math Monthly assessments with goal setting to track student progress, teachers will use data to drive instruction.
9. Teachers will utilize technology to provide engaging lessons.
10. Monthly data analysis and chats with grade levels and RTI teacher.

Person Responsible Ann Perez (ann.perez@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address the schoolwide improvements by consistent monitoring of data, and will have a live data wall.

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 school plans to build positive relationships with parents by actively recruiting parents, families, and community stakeholders to be involved in the school. This will be through a variety of events throughout the year, and involvement clubs (SAC, PTA, Dad's Club). Communication will be done through meetings, ParentLinks, flyers, and newsletters.

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$84,994.79
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2321 - Lake Magdalene Elem. School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$46,200.21
			Notes: RTI Resource Teacher			
	3374	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	2321 - Lake Magdalene Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$3,295.00
			Notes: Reflex Math Online Program- Whole School to build student fluency in math facts.			
	3374	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	2321 - Lake Magdalene Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$2,250.00
			Notes: Flocabulary Online Resources for teachers to supplement instruction.			
	1381	649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	2321 - Lake Magdalene Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$9,324.00
			Notes: Recordex SimplicityCam document cameras needed for teachers to use to enhance and engage student learning.			
	6500	519-Technology-Related Supplies	2321 - Lake Magdalene Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$23,925.58

	Notes: Purchase of additional Chromebooks for students to use to for our online programs to improve student achievement.	
	Total:	**$84,994.79**