

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Tampa Bay Boulevard 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	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Tampa Bay Boulevard Elementary School

3111 W TAMPA BAY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Perez

Start Date for this Principal: 11/2/2009

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: D (40%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	17

Tampa Bay Boulevard Elementary School

3111 W TAMPA BAY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33607

[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	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

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.

All Tampa Bay Boulevard Elementary students will become successful, responsible, life-long learners through effective, rigorous and differentiated instruction designed for the 21st century learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Students for Life!

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vinueza, Glenda	Principal	
Perez, Michelle	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/2/2009, Michelle 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.*

1

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

53

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: D (40%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	76	82	83	65	94	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	23	18	16	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
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	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	

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	1	0	0	1	0	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	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	92	97	79	116	86	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
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	22	31	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	8	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	92	97	79	116	86	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
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	22	31	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	8	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	50%	52%	57%	47%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	55%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	50%	53%	45%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	54%	63%	51%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	62%	43%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	51%	40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	50%	53%	38%	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	42%	53%	-11%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	54%	-8%	62%	-16%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	57%	-8%	64%	-15%
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	60%	-18%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	51%	-13%	53%	-15%
	2018	41%	52%	-11%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	22	45	57	35	58	57	13				
ELL	38	55	66	46	58	45	22				
BLK	39	46	50	33	46	36	35				
HSP	52	56	61	52	61	46	39				
WHT	59	60		53	67						
FRL	50	54	58	48	59	45	37				
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	21	38	42	30	38	22	39				
ELL	28	46	43	40	45	28	38				
BLK	33	30	17	35	32	23	38				
HSP	44	45	41	50	41	21	48				
WHT	50	46		55	69						
FRL	42	42	35	46	38	25	44				
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	18	39	33	26	33	45	6				
ELL	31	49	39	44	47	52	21				
BLK	27	47	50	41	21						
HSP	47	54	45	53	45	50	42				
WHT	76	67		56	50						
FRL	46	54	45	50	42	39	40				

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
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	48
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	41
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	53
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	60
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	51
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.

Based on 18/19 Science school FSA data at 39 achievement points earned and 19/20 Science formative data showed student proficiency at 49.35% in 5th grade. Lack of previous content knowledge is a contributing factor.

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

Science Achievement scores declined 6 points on FSA in 18-19 as compared to the previous tested year. Factors include student lack of content knowledge and prerequisites.

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 data showed 15 percentage points lower than the state average in 2019. Student are lacking in acquiring needed foundational skills to be successful with new material introduced. The need for more collaborative math planning is evident.

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

The ELA Lowest 25th percentile component went up by 24 points from the previous year. Collaborative planning focused on standards alignment and student needs based instruction led to this increase.

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

Improving Attendance

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

1. Collaborative weekly planning sessions for standards aligned instruction for ELA, Math, and Science.
2. Improving attendance
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Increasing student achievement in ELA, Math and Science by improving instructional practices, through collaborative planning and building teacher capacity.

Measurable Outcome: By May 28, 2021, ELA, Math and Science Achievement and learning gains will increase by 5% points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will actively participate in structured weekly standard aligned collaborative planning sessions facilitated by the school's instructional coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When planning effective lessons and assessment specifically designed to what the standard calls for, student learning is focused on intended targets for specific outcomes. Instructional coaches work with teachers on designing lesson plans, support implementation, and provide ongoing coaching and professional development to build capacity.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic coaches/resource teachers will facilitate the weekly planning sessions with all grade levels. The instructional coaches will help teachers to collaborate, plan and assess lessons aligned the rigor of the standard. Academic coaches will support lesson implementation, provide ongoing coaching and professional development to build teacher skill sets and capacity among the staff.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Teachers along with academic coaches will progress monitor, analyze data to determine student need and make necessary adjustments to instruction.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Teachers will incorporate iReady, SIPPS, and Achieve 3000 into their daily instructional program.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increasing student learning engagement in all areas through strategic planning, effective lesson delivery, and providing targeted interventions to identified groups.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA achievement scores by 5% on FSA, Math and Science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Reading Coaches, ELA Resource teacher, Math Resource teacher, and the Academic Intervention Specialist will facilitate planning, coach teachers, model lessons, analyze data with teachers, provide intensive intervention to identified groups and provide professional development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A structured schedule will be provided for the implementation of SIPPS, i-Ready usage, grade level standard aligned planning and MTSS tiered instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Reading Coaches, ELA Resource teacher, Math Resource teacher, and the Academic Intervention Specialist will facilitate planning, coach teachers, model lessons, analyze data with teachers, provide intensive intervention to identified groups and provide professional development.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

A master schedule will provide the structure to include collaborative planning sessions for all teams to be able to attend.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Increasing student attendance is addressed by a program where parents are called and notified at different spans of time for days missed. An incentive award is in place for classes with perfect attendance and for students called "Beat the Bell."

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 year is started by welcoming families during preplanning with a back to school Open House. Parent nights are held focusing on academic content and to increase family involvement within the school. School staff, parents and community work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. The school is committed and works hard to build strong positive relationships with our families and community. Parents are encouraged to participate in all events via different media sources such as sending home flyers, parent links, making phone calls, school website, and social media outlets. Every effort is made to communicate every child's progress and involving all families through progress alerts and parent/teacher conference nights.

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: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00