

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Seminole Heights 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Seminole Heights Elementary School

6201 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33604

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Francine Lazarus

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (46%) 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	N/A
* 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

Seminole Heights Elementary School

6201 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33604

[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	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

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.

The mission of Seminole Heights staff is to engage students in a program of academic excellence that will promote collaboration and problem solving preparing them with leadership skills to be responsible citizens in our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision Statement of Seminole Elementary School is to create an environment where learners achieve academic excellence becoming effective communicators and decision makers.

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
Lazarus, Francine	Principal	Design & implement the School Improvement Plan Manage the daily operations of the school Provide instructional leadership to achieve the goals outlined in the School Improvement Plan

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Francine Lazarus

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.*

4

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.*

3

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (46%) 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	N/A
* 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	66	51	76	79	44	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	388
Attendance below 90 percent	14	4	10	8	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	13	23	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	26	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	5	2	3	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/29/2020

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	60	51	73	75	50	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	375
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	58	88	74	61	76	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	8	12	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	38	49	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	7	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	48%	52%	57%	42%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	55%	58%	46%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	50%	53%	38%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	54%	63%	38%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	57%	62%	48%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	46%	51%	58%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	50%	53%	52%	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	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
	2018	47%	55%	-8%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	54%	-21%	62%	-29%
	2018	32%	55%	-23%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	57%	-18%	64%	-25%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	60%	-17%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	61%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	51%	-10%	53%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	52%	-9%	55%	-12%
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	59	64	38	66	58					
ELL											
BLK	28	44	56	32	55	56	26				
HSP	70	61		48	57		58				
MUL	53	58		47	45						
WHT	47	54		42	57						
FRL	45	52	58	38	51	52	40				
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	26	39	24	28	61	54	29				
ELL	36			36							
BLK	31	36	31	31	47	33	13				
HSP	49	54	50	38	66	70	39				
MUL	60			57							
WHT	58	70		49	69		71				
FRL	42	51	41	38	63	55	37				
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	38	43	9	41	54					
ELL	23			8							
BLK	27	47		29	50	80	31				
HSP	45	44	25	35	42	45	33				
MUL	38			38							
WHT	51	54	55	46	53		71				
FRL	40	48	38	35	46	56	53				

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)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	64
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	42
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	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
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	50
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	50
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.

Math achievement - 41%

Not all teachers fully understood the depth & limits of the state standards.

Teachers didn't work collaboratively to design standards-based lessons & valid common assessments, analyze data & make strategic instructional decisions.

From 2018 to 2019 the math achievement was stagnant and remained at 41%

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

Math learning gains declined from 63% to 55% from 2018 to 2019.

Teachers were resistant to making modifications in instructional practices and common assessments between unit and interim measures. This was compounded by issues with the math curriculum materials & time for the math coach to collaboratively with teachers during planning sessions.

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.

Math achievement - 41% (Seminole) 63% (State)

This gap was consistent from the prior year when compared to the state average. Historically there has been a disconnect between teachers' understanding of the standards, their delivery of instruction, their assessment of students & their enrichment/remediation efforts.

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

ELA bottom quartile increased from 41% to 57%.

The reading coach worked with teachers in coaching cycles and in planning sessions. Weekly planning time was built into the mornings while students attend the "morning mile." I-ready weekly pass rates and usage rates were monitored.

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

For each year reporting EWS data the number of students scoring a level 1 on the statewide assessment in ELA & math indicated a concern that is directly related to the standards-based curriculum being implemented at Seminole Elementary.

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

1. Math achievement & learning gains
2. ELA achievement & learning gains
3. School-wide behavior management & character development
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	"C" rated school for the last 5 years. In 2019 ELA, math & science achievement were below 50% and ELA & math learning gains were below 60%. For 20-21 school year we will focus on ensuring that teachers hold high expectations for student achievement & learning gains along with eliminating any barriers to these goals such as behavior management issues.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021, at least 62% of students will achieve proficiency in ELA, math & science, at least 62% of students will make learning gains in ELA & math and at least 62% of bottom quartile students will make learning gains in ELA & math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Francine Lazarus (francine.lazarus@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institute a comprehensive system for designing & monitoring effective standards-based instruction. 2. Create & implement a school-wide behavior management & character development system.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2019, the % of students proficient in ELA was 48%, the % of students proficient in math was 41% and the % of students proficient in science was 44%. The % of students making learning gains in ELA was 53% and the % of students making learning gains in math was 55%. The % of bottom quartile students making learning gains in ELA was 57% and the % of bottom quartile students making learning gains in math was 57%. 2. There were 85 behavior incidents documented during the 19-20 school year. On the 2020 ASQi survey only 30.23% of teachers reported that students at this school follow rules of conduct.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1a. Hire a reading, math and science coach to support collaborative standards-based planning, lesson implementation and student progress monitoring.
- 1b. Provide PD & resources needed to implement i-Ready reading & math instruction, SIPPS phonics instruction/interventions and Achieve 3000 reading instruction. Monitor with lesson plan templates, content coach support, walk-through and student performance data.
- 1c. Purchase the "Developing Student Ownership" books for instructional personnel to engage in a faculty study to change instructional practices. Monitor through classroom observations.
- 2a. Create a school-wide behavior management plan & train faculty, staff & students on the plan components. Monitor with behavior incident & teacher survey data.
- 2b. Communicate the plan components to families.
- 2c. Utilize Eagle Bucks & a school store to reward students for positive behavior.
- 2d. Provide PD for faculty/staff on Covey's 7 Habits.
- 2e. Teach students about Covey's 7 Habits & reinforce the use of these on a daily basis.

Person Responsible Francine Lazarus (francine.lazarus@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.

The following list includes events & initiatives that are designed to build a positive school culture and environment to ensure all stakeholders (teachers, parents, students, staff, community members, business partners) are involved in our school community:

- Walk to Hillsborough High 2020
- Parent & Family Engagement Plan
- Parent Teacher Association
- School Advisory Council
- Family Academic Events
- Black History Celebration
- Hispanic Heritage Fiesta
- Morning Show
- Eagle Vision You-Tube Channel
- Covey's 7 Habits with Leader-of-the-Month Awards
- Back-to-School Picnic
- Community Events
- Teacher Appreciation Events
- Volunteer Appreciation Breakfast
- Grandparents' Breakfast
- Student Performances & Art Shows
- Eagle Bucks & the School Store
- Awards Ceremonies
- Friday Focus Faculty/Staff Newsletter
- Climate Surveys
- Holiday Events
- HOST & SHUMPS
- TRIBE Community Partnership
- Reading Pals with United Way
- Birthday Recognition
- 5th Grade Banquet

Conference Nights
Open House
Safety Patrols
Academic Incentives
School Flyers & Newsletters
ParentLink Calls, Texts & Emails
Positive Referrals

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	3921 - Seminole Heights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			Notes: Math Resource			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3921 - Seminole Heights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			Notes: Reading Coach			
Total:						\$0.00