Tampa Palms Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Tampa Palms Elementary School

6100 TAMPA PALMS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angela Gluth

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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

Tampa Palms Elementary School

6100 TAMPA PALMS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[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	No	46%

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

School Grades History

Year	**2019-20**	**2018-19**	**2017-18**	**2016-17**
Grade	A	A	A	A

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 provide all students with the opportunities to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to realize their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tampa Palms will be in the top one percent of elementary schools in the nation.

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
Lippek, MaryAnn	Principal	Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches) The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County. HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development. Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact. Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/1/2020, Angela Gluth

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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	118	115	120	126	122	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	13	8	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	127	132	132	128	141	161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	821
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	9	13	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
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	3	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	127	132	132	128	141	161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	821
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	9	13	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	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	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	76%	52%	57%	76%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	55%	58%	59%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	76%	54%	63%	77%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	57%	62%	60%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	51%	37%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	50%	53%	72%	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	73%	52%	21%	58%	15%	
	2018	74%	53%	21%	57%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison	-1%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%	
	2018	77%	55%	22%	56%	21%	
Same Grade Comparison	-7%						
Cohort Comparison	-4%						
05	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%	
	2018	64%	51%	13%	55%	9%	
Same Grade Comparison	7%						
Cohort Comparison	-6%						

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%	
	2018	78%	55%	23%	62%	16%	
Same Grade Comparison	0%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%	
	2018	77%	57%	20%	62%	15%	
Same Grade Comparison	-5%						
Cohort Comparison	-6%						
05	2019	70%	54%	16%	60%	10%	
	2018	72%	54%	18%	61%	11%	
Same Grade Comparison	-2%						
Cohort Comparison	-7%						

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	68%	51%	17%	53%	15%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	68%	52%	16%	55%	13%
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	37	57	44	46	58	58	38				
ELL	68	70	39	74	79	63	52				
ASN	93	79		95	92		95				
BLK	52	53	45	46	53	48	43				
HSP	71	76	62	64	62	54	55				
MUL	71	69		71	62						
WHT	77	72	25	82	70	46	76				
FRL	58	66	47	60	61	48	55				
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	40	45	24	56	42	27	38				
ELL	59	65	44	75	65	58	36				
ASN	94	84		96	91		88				
BLK	45	52	41	46	40	15	41				
HSP	62	57	25	68	57	38	59				
MUL	69	63		67	58		60				
WHT	79	61	50	85	68	61	77				
FRL	59	56	40	64	56	38	52				
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	40	39	44	50	52	43	38				
ELL	49	42	43	64	50	33					
ASN	92	72	67	97	84		89				
BLK	56	49	50	51	31	21	48				
HSP	69	54	50	67	63	42	57				
MUL	78	54		78	54						
WHT	78	61	45	83	59	50	83				
FRL	59	51	51	60	40	25	55				

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	68
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	86
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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	66
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	66

Hispanic Students	
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	68
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	64
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	59
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 administration of the FSA for Spring 2020 did not occur due to Covid-19. When looking at other data sources, Tampa Palms would like to continue to focus on learning gains in the subgroup populations and the bottom quartile subgroup: SWD, Black and Free/Reduce Lunch. Historically, these subgroups showed a need for improvement. There is a discrepancy between gains achieved in ELA compared to math.

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

Tampa Palms was looking forward to seeing gains as measured by FSA 2020 in our bottom quartile group along with gains in the following subgroups: SWD, Black, Free/Reduced Lunch. Unfortunately,

FSA 2020 was not administered. In looking at other school-based data sources, the need to focus on the bottom quartile and gains for subgroup populations still exists.

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.

Looking at prior data, the subgroup with the largest gap would be the bottom quartile group as a whole: ELA- white 25 %, black 45%, ELL 39 %, FRL- 47%. Math- white 46%, black- 48%, ELL- 63%, FRL- 48%. There is a great need to focus on the bottom quartile subgroup and each group within this group.
When looking at the achievement scores, black student scored lower than most other subgroups.

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

The Asian subgroup historically outperforms all other subgroups. Additionally, the ELL population made gains in math with 63% of the bottom quartile in that group making gains.

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

1. Learning gains for the bottom quartile.
2. ELA & Math Achievement for the black subgroup of students.
3. Decreasing the number of students in grades 4 & 5 scoring at a level 1 on FSA Reading and/or Math.

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

1. Bottom 25%- Increase the number of students in all subgroups showing a gain; especially in ELA.
2. Achievement- Increase the number of black students scoring a level 3 or higher in ELA and math.
3. Learning Gains- Increase the number of black students showing a gain in ELA and Math.
4.Increase the number of students (within all subgroups) scoring a level 3 or high on the Science Assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the historical data, an instructional focus needs to address the discrepancy between the percent of students in the bottom quartile who make learning gains. ELA subgroup BQ date: white- 25%, black- 45%, ELL-39%, FRL- 47%. Math: white- 46%, black- 48%, ELL-63%, FRL- 48%. The effective use of standards-based instruction along with differentiation strategies will close the achievement gap for students. Standards- based panning and instruction will allow teachers to clearly communicate the standards being taught and what students must know and do to show understanding of the standard. The use of differentiated instruction will allow for students to acquire the necessary content knowledge.
Measurable Outcome:	Through the use of standards-based planning and differentiated strategies the bottom quartile subgroups will increase by 5 percentage points respectfully.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	MaryAnn Lippek (maryann.lippek@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PSLT will continue to collaborate with grade level teams to identify students in need of additional supports and which supports may improve learning. iReady and other district approved computer based programs for ELA & Math will be used to enhance instruction for content needing remediation. Small group instruction during the school day and as part of an extended learning program will be used injunction with research-based materials/books to provide intensive reading support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PSLT will support teacher's instruction and provide feedback on alignment. iReady is a research based program approved by the district and available to all students both at school and at home.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a schedule that allows the PSLT to collaborate with grade level/content teams on a regular basis.
2. Create a system/schedule to closely monitor student achievement & gains.
3. Use walkthrough data to provide targeted feedback to teachers in relation to standards- based instruction and DI.
4. Provide and communicate PD offerings in this area.
5. Small group learning opportunities such as ELP, or worth with the reading coach will be used.

Person Responsible MaryAnn Lippek (maryann.lippek@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Decrease the number of students making harmful or threatening comments. Tampa Palms is continuing to work on educating students on the effects of harmful/hurtful statements and how to express feelings of anger or sadness in a constructive manner.

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.

Tampa Palms uses a variety of strategies to foster a positive learning community. Each year prior to assigning students to classes, parent input forms are distributed. This provides families with an opportunity to share with the school their child's learning needs and the teaching style they are hoping for from their their child's teacher. This also allows school administration to make effective matches with placement.
The role of the teacher is critical in establishing and maintaining a positive learning environment. Teachers are tasked with forming high expectations for all students and communicating those expectations out to stakeholders.
Tampa Palms utilizes the Good Choice Pledge to set a positive tone for learning. The pledge is posted in all learning environments around campus. It is shared with all families. It is reviewed and recited each day on the morning show. It is the foundation of all of our work. It provides a set of clear expectations and allows for students to analyze their behavior/choices in order to make a better choice in the future.
The guidance team provides opportunities for students to be a part of small groups as needed. Classroom guidance lessons are used to teach and maintain a positive learning environment.
Reward and recognition programs help encourage positive behaviors. Tampa Palms has a weekly Super Star Student recognition program along with a monthly Citizen of the Month program. At the end of the grading period, students who consistently made good choices earn a citizenship ribbon.

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				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			4261 - Tampa Palms Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$0.00
			Notes: Tampa Palms may need to use SAC fundraising funds or other school funds to purchase additional school-based technology such as, but not limited to mini CPUs or laptops. The purchase of supplemental small group instructional materials to enhance learning will be needed.			

	Total:	$0.00