

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Turner Bartels K 8 School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Turner Bartels K 8 School

9190 IMPERIAL OAK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: R. Lamarr Buggs, Jr

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| 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) | 47% |
| 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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (57%) |
| 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 was approved by the Hillsborough County School Board on 10/19/2020.

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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Turner Bartels K 8 School

9190 IMPERIAL OAK 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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School KG-8 | No | 47% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 67% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | B | B | B |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hillsborough County School Board on 10/19/2020.

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.

Through relationships student achievement will be fostered using engaging activities, data-driven standard-based curriculum, and unconditional regard for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building genuine relationships to ensure the success of all stakeholders.

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 |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Buggs, Robert | Principal | Staff Evaluations Classroom Observations Counts Maintenance Clerical Budget Hiring Social Studies Electives |
| Enis, Jacqueline | Assistant Principal | Master Schedule Articulation/Attrition Subject Area Leaders Testing MS Field Trips MS Guidance Schedule Changes 8th Grade/6th Grade MTSS/RtI |
| Lowry, David | Assistant Principal | Safety/Duty Food Service FBA Committee Maintenance Athletics Mathematics MS Team Leaders Marquee Bells 7th Grade/6th Grade Transportation Pictures Keys Walkies |
| Perez-Reinaldo, Michelle | Assistant Principal | PK - 2nd Volunteers Testing iReady SIPPS Pictures Specials Testing Principal Weekly LC Duty Data Walls Field Trips Scheduling Elem Guidance |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| | | Elem MTSS Keys Walkies Grades/Report Cards PLC Progress Reports Team Leaders |
| Quinta, Cynthia | Assistant Principal | 3rd - 5th Volunteers Testing iReady Achieve 3000 Pictures Data Walls Field Trips Scheduling Elem Guidance Elem MTSS ELP Grades/Report Cards PLC Progress Reports Team Leaders |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/29/2020, R. Lamarr Buggs, Jr

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

89

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--------|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|--|--------|

| | |
|--|--|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| 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) | 47% |
| 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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (57%) |
| 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 | 119 | 136 | 147 | 156 | 183 | 163 | 214 | 212 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1539 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 48 | 41 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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 | 11 | 38 | 47 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 60 | 50 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 |

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 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 146 | 155 | 169 | 206 | 187 | 161 | 225 | 209 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1720 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 23 | 18 | 12 | 14 | 6 | 7 | 36 | 26 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 21 | 41 | 68 | 46 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 |

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 | 1 | 22 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

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 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 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 | 146 | 155 | 169 | 206 | 187 | 161 | 225 | 209 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1720 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 23 | 18 | 12 | 14 | 6 | 7 | 36 | 26 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 21 | 41 | 68 | 46 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 |

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 | 1 | 22 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

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 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 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 | 63% | 57% | 61% | 65% | 60% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | 56% | 59% | 56% | 60% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 52% | 54% | 39% | 53% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 62% | 55% | 62% | 66% | 60% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 62% | 57% | 59% | 60% | 60% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 49% | 52% | 39% | 54% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 59% | 50% | 56% | 61% | 54% | 53% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Social Studies Achievement | 68% | 77% | 78% | 74% | 78% | 75% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (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 | 70% | 52% | 18% | 58% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 65% | 53% | 12% | 57% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 67% | 55% | 12% | 58% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 77% | 55% | 22% | 56% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 72% | 54% | 18% | 56% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 51% | 10% | 55% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 50% | 53% | -3% | 54% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 52% | 1% | 52% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 56% | 54% | 2% | 52% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 52% | 1% | 51% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 52% | 53% | -1% | 56% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 54% | 9% | 58% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 62% | 54% | 8% | 62% | 0% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 60% | 55% | 5% | 62% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 57% | 57% | 0% | 64% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 57% | 13% | 62% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 65% | 54% | 11% | 60% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 54% | 5% | 61% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 53% | 49% | 4% | 55% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 48% | 8% | 52% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 61% | 62% | -1% | 54% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 61% | 1% | 54% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 22% | 31% | -9% | 46% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 14% | 29% | -15% | 45% | -31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 70% | 51% | 19% | 53% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 52% | 15% | 55% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 47% | 47% | 0% | 48% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 48% | 8% | 50% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -20% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 63% | 67% | -4% | 71% | -8% |
| 2018 | 63% | 65% | -2% | 71% | -8% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 91% | 63% | 28% | 61% | 30% |
| 2018 | 94% | 63% | 31% | 62% | 32% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 57% | 43% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 56% | -56% |
| Compare | | 100% | | | |

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 | 26 | 43 | 39 | 21 | 43 | 43 | 18 | 29 | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 56 | 53 | 40 | 56 | 43 | 36 | 27 | | | |
| ASN | 84 | 77 | 69 | 90 | 83 | | 84 | 88 | 96 | | |
| BLK | 51 | 51 | 48 | 45 | 51 | 40 | 38 | 66 | 75 | | |
| HSP | 52 | 53 | 39 | 51 | 59 | 44 | 49 | 58 | 91 | | |
| MUL | 69 | 59 | | 71 | 79 | | 79 | 92 | 100 | | |
| WHT | 68 | 63 | 47 | 68 | 61 | 42 | 69 | 70 | 94 | | |
| FRL | 46 | 52 | 42 | 45 | 54 | 44 | 43 | 57 | 85 | | |
| 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 | 20 | 35 | 36 | 17 | 26 | 26 | 20 | 28 | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 57 | 55 | 33 | 52 | 49 | 11 | 41 | | | |
| ASN | 84 | 68 | 53 | 90 | 83 | | 86 | 75 | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 52 | 48 | 47 | 49 | 33 | 44 | 54 | 65 | | |
| HSP | 58 | 59 | 47 | 54 | 57 | 45 | 57 | 52 | 92 | | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 66 | 63 | 64 | 69 | 71 | 45 | 71 | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 61 | 47 | 68 | 68 | 46 | 72 | 80 | 86 | | |
| FRL | 50 | 53 | 50 | 48 | 51 | 39 | 48 | 52 | 73 | | |
| 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 | 16 | 28 | 25 | 24 | 36 | 34 | 17 | 37 | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 39 | 34 | 36 | 47 | 38 | 30 | 25 | 83 | | |
| ASN | 85 | 74 | 56 | 90 | 77 | 27 | 78 | | 100 | | |
| BLK | 48 | 48 | 43 | 47 | 48 | 41 | 42 | 65 | 68 | | |
| HSP | 58 | 50 | 31 | 57 | 55 | 38 | 49 | 67 | 81 | | |
| MUL | 73 | 50 | | 83 | 71 | | 80 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 61 | 41 | 74 | 66 | 43 | 74 | 85 | 93 | | |
| FRL | 45 | 43 | 36 | 47 | 50 | 40 | 42 | 60 | 73 | | |

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 | 63 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 74 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 627 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| 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 | 46 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 84 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 78 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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.

In 2019, 8th Grade Mathematics increased to 22% which was below the state 46% average and the district 31% average. In 2018, the 8th Grade Mathematics scores were the lowest assessment performances at 14% compared to the district average of 29% and state average performance of 45%. The 8th Grade Mathematics scores have improved from 2018- 2019 but remain the lowest performance of all the scores. If the trend continues, we should expect our school scores to increase +8 points and become relative with the district's average which is still well below the state average.

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

In 2019, fourth grade mathematics score declined by -13 points. Fourth graders Math score were 57% compared to their 70% Math scores in 2018. In 2019 the district average for 4th grade Math was 57% which was the same as the school's fourth grade performance. However, the state's 4th grade Math average was 64%, indicating that the district's average was 7% below the state's average. If the trends continues, we will perform close to the school district's average but below the state's average on 4th grade Math.

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.

Grade level Data for 8th grade Algebra and Geometry show the biggest gap when compared to District and State Data. In 2019, TBK8 8th Grade Geometry scores reflect a 100% passing rate against the District's and the State's averages of 57%, a difference of +43 points. In 2018 the school's Algebra data shows a 94% performance score and in 2019, the school had a 91% performance score. The decrease of -3 points far surpasses the District's 63% average and the State's 61% average. TBK8 Algebra scores outperforms the District's average by +28 points and the State's average +30 points and is the greatest gap in the data. All students that score a level 3 or higher are placed in Algebra.

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

Overall Grade level data reveals that 5th Grade ELA and Science scores showed the most improved subjects. In 2019, the 5th Grade Science scored 70% which exceeded the District's average of 51% and the state's average of 53%. The school was +19 points above the district average and +17 points above the state average.

Fifth Grade ELA scores was 72% and outperformed the district average of 54% an +18 point increase and the state average of 56% by +16 points.

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

One area of concern from the EWS data is the "Students with Disabilities" indicator. This applies mainly to students in the 6th, 7th & 8th grades and specifically is tied to Level I students who were in the lower 25th percentile in ELA and Math. A potential concern for SWD is the amount of support provided to each student.

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

1. Subgroup- students with disabilities
2. L25% ELA & Math
3. Improve 8th grade Science achievement
4. Improve Civics achievement -
5. Schoolwide systems

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:**

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | ESE teachers and General Ed teachers will plan lessons with specific modifications as needed with the best interest of the SWD. Teachers will be provided an opportunity to learn current and innovative strategies that works for SWD. These best practices strategies will help to support our SWD. |
| Measurable Outcome: | ESE teachers will work with the general education teachers 20 minutes daily to assist SWD. This student-focused support will increase SWD student achievement by +4 points in ELA and Math. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Robert Buggs (robert.buggs@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Turner Bartels K-8 will utilize *Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), *Professional development *Specific research-based curriculum/strategies for instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | ESE teachers will work with General Ed teachers to support and deliver curriculum specifically to students' needs and common planning time will be allowed in the master schedule. Tutoring and reteaching opportunities will support students in small pull-out groups to establish explicit instruction. Case managers will support ESE teachers and General Ed teachers with updates IEPs and to 504's to strengthen the support systems. |

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Learning Community is a best practice intervention that is based around continuous improvement and determining how to modify instructional practices to ensure the best learning outcome. Teachers will be given differentiated training, and professional development opportunities to support SWD. We will work to personalize instruction based on students need.

1. ESE teachers will work with General Ed teachers to support and deliver curriculum specifically to students' needs.
2. Common planning time for Gen. Ed teachers and Co-Teachers.
3. Reteaching opportunities will support students in small pull-out groups to establish and confirm standards and explicit instruction.
4. Case managers will update and apply changes to IEPs to ensure the most accurate support systems for success are provided to General education teachers and SWDs' parents.

Person Responsible Robert Buggs (robert.buggs@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | Increase Learning Gains for SWD and Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile students in ELA and Math by implementing ELP tutoring, daily support facilitators and small learning groups. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | By implementing the use of best practices and increasing student engagement strategies, learning gains for SWD in ELA will increase +4 points from 43% to 47% and for the lowest 25% students in ELA will increase from 39% to 43%. By implementing best practices and increasing the use of student engagement strategies, learning gains for SWD and the lowest 25% in Math will increase from 43% to 47%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Robert Buggs (robert.buggs@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Reciprocal/Expert Teaching Small group instruction AVID schoolwide strategies Professional development opportunities |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Data from 2018-2019 compared with 2019-20 revealed that students were compliant and engaged in rigorous learning tasks. This rationale is supported by comparing the 2018-2019 school grade components with the 2019-20 student data. The data shows that SWD increased in ELA from 35% to 43%, and in Math SWD increased from 17% to 21%. The data shows that our lowest 25th percentile students made gains in ELA 36% to 39% and math gains for the lowest 25th percentile was 26% to 43%. We believe that when teachers apply best strategies, use student engagement strategies and lead small group instruction, TBK8 students in all struggling subgroups will engage with the content and by extension increase learning outcomes thus raising the achievement gap. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a master schedule that supports weekly standards-focused PLCs. The PLC will assist and support teachers so they can focus on planning rigorous lessons that are aligned to the LAFS and MAFS.
2. Set up schedule for coaching cycles to coach teachers on how to plan for and implement rigorous standards based instruction. Log turned in weekly.
3. Create weekly rotations for I-Ready lab time with Teachers. iReady time and lessons are monitored weekly, and the results will address the needs of students.
4. Tutoring and ELP will provide extra reading groups and target SWD as well as the lowest 25%. ELP/ tutoring will record student attendance and achievement.
5. Daily/rotating support facilitation will provide extra reading and math assistance to struggling students. The classroom teachers will directly monitor the actions and implementation to ensure students' needs are addressed.

Person Responsible Robert Buggs (robert.buggs@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

FRL= 34%

Elementary

3rd grade- 4 students were retained in 2019-20.

5th grade- 1 student retained in 2019-20

***Retainees will receive an 8th grade AVID mentor.**

Middle

In 2019-20 49 ELL students failed Social studies. Professional Development for Social Studies teachers to help facilitate and differentiate lessons for ELL students.

6th grade- Had the highest number of students administratively promoted.

8th grade-43 students had early warning indicators in 2019-20.

***8th grade students will receive a high school monitor.**

***All students will receive a mentor.**

Increase attendance rate

***Social worker will provide homeroom and individual incentives**

Increase student achievement

***Enroll level I in afterschool tutoring.**

***Check and Connect**

***Review all classroom weighting scales**

***Extended Learning Program**

***Credit checks**

***Quarterly grade reviews**

***Engaging lessons that promote student discovery**

***FSA-style embedded questions**

***Professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance learning environment and facilitation.**

Reduce the number of suspensions

***Established PBIS**

***Check and Connect**

Middle school teacher Check and Connect program/mentor

***36 students with 2 or more identifiers from the previous year.**

***Weekly connections for increased engagement.**

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.

- *Visible & engaged PTSA
- *SAC committee (virtual)
- *Tiger talk
- *STEM student of the month
- *Morning show connections/announcements
- *Grade level incentives
- *Schoolwide incentives
- *Joint discussions and activities with business partners
- *All staff having unconditional regard for all students and colleagues
- *Positive Behavior/Reward System in each classroom
- *Clear classroom procedures
- *Clear staff roles and responsibilities

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: Professional Learning Communities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |