

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Washington 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Washington Elementary School

1407 ESTELLE ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Monica Barber

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: F (25%) 2015-16: F (21%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Washington Elementary School

1407 ESTELLE ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>97%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>96%</p>

School Grades History

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

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 an equitable education and safe environment that supports and empowers our students, families, and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Building
Together
We
Excel

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barber, Monica	Principal	
Harris, Zemenaye	Assistant Principal	
Robinson, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Monica Barber

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: F (25%) 2015-16: F (21%)
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	58	67	41	58	52	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321
Attendance below 90 percent	15	36	16	21	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	24%	52%	57%	14%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	35%	55%	58%	31%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	53%	38%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	35%	54%	63%	15%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	57%	62%	31%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	46%	51%	40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	50%	53%	8%	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	21%	52%	-31%	58%	-37%
	2018	15%	53%	-38%	57%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	17%	55%	-38%	58%	-41%
	2018	29%	55%	-26%	56%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
	2018	28%	51%	-23%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	20%	54%	-34%	62%	-42%
	2018	22%	55%	-33%	62%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	31%	57%	-26%	64%	-33%
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	30%	51%	-21%	53%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	24%	52%	-28%	55%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	27	36	50	39	73						
ELL	10	38		27	54						
BLK	26	33	39	37	52	42	32				
HSP	16	42	50	30	58	82	43				
FRL	23	36	44	34	54	62	35				
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	19	26		25	47	33					
ELL	17	64		22	80	70	9				
BLK	23	43	39	36	66	53	28				
HSP	20	52	80	31	79	64	8				
FRL	22	46	55	34	70	58	24				
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		26	18	6	28	28					
ELL	8	16		15	35						
BLK	13	34	43	14	33	39	8				
HSP	16	24		15	25						
FRL	13	31	38	14	31	40	8				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
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.

Our black and ELL students showed the lowest performance in reading proficiency.

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

Our black and ELL students showed the lowest performance in reading proficiency.

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.

ELA Learning Gains

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

We improved in our Science Achievement Points.

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

Our black and ELL students showed the lowest performance in reading proficiency.

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

1. Reading proficiency for Black students
2. Reading proficiency for ELL students
3. Reading proficiency for ALL students
4. Math proficiency for ALL students
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students come into school behind grade level and gap widens as they move from kindergarten to upper grades. Students have gaps in content knowledge and skills, teachers lack content knowledge, and teachers lack ability to blend knowledge of students and knowledge of pedagogy to create lessons. Also, teachers lack clarity on designing individual lessons that scaffold skill building and pedagogy.

Measurable Outcome: 50% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Monica Barber (monica.barber@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will have two reading coaches, one AIS, and one Rtl Resource Teacher to support students and staff. Coaches and AIS will facilitate planning coaching cycles as well as pull small groups of students. We will have school-wide common structures for writing and small group guided reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We want to narrow the opportunity gap by developing teachers' understanding of brain research and engaging students. We will use the text, "Culturally Responsive Teaching & The Brain" by Zaretta Hammond.

Action Steps to Implement

Focus walk-through on data collection on school priorities.

Person Responsible Monica Barber (monica.barber@hcps.net)

Administration will attend planning sessions and professional development.

Person Responsible Monica Barber (monica.barber@hcps.net)

Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback.

Person Responsible Monica Barber (monica.barber@hcps.net)

We will monitor the progress of our black and ELL students based on our school improvement goals.

Person Responsible Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students come into school behind grade level and gap widens as they move from kindergarten to upper grades. Students have gaps in content knowledge and skills, teachers lack content knowledge, and teachers lack ability to blend knowledge of students and knowledge of pedagogy to create lessons. Also, teachers lack clarity on designing individual lessons that scaffold skill building and pedagogy.

Measurable Outcome: 50% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in mathematics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: We will have two math coaches and one Rtl Resource Teacher to support students and staff. Coaches will facilitate planning coaching cycles as well as pull small groups of students. In addition, coaches and teachers will work collaboratively to use and create monthly assessments. We will use the data from the assessments to drive our instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We want to narrow the opportunity gap by developing teachers' understanding of brain research and engaging students. We will use the text, "Culturally Responsive Teaching & The Brain" by Zaretta Hammond.

Action Steps to Implement

Focus walk-through on data collection on school priorities.

Person Responsible Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)

Administration will attend planning sessions and professional development.

Person Responsible Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)

Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback.

Person Responsible Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)

We will monitor the progress of our black and ELL students based on our school improvement goals.

Person Responsible Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continue to provide differentiated professional development and follow-up feedback based on progress monitoring data. Also, we will develop training for our paraprofessionals and allocate additional time for instructional planning to ensure we are meeting the learning needs of all students.

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.

50% of our caregivers will attend events or provide input designed to center their voices. 90% of caregiver conferences will empower the caregiver as the individual who knows their child the most and will shift the balance of power to the caregiver. 100% of the teachers will teach using strategies that empower students and make space for them to direct the curriculum and learning experiences.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00