

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Wimauma Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Wimauma Elementary School

5709 HICKMAN ST, Wimauma, FL 33598

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lebron Lebron Bravo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	16

Wimauma Elementary School

5709 HICKMAN ST, Wimauma, FL 33598

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To strengthen our community by educating, nurturing, and inspiring students to reach their greatest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a school that is highly regarded for its academic excellence, and for its contribution in actively serving and improving the community in which it operates.

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
Lebron-Bravo, Ismael	Principal	Instructional leader of building and oversees daily operations
Fletcher, Karen	Assistant Principal	Assist with instruction and running daily operations of school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Lebron Lebron Bravo

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

1

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

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

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	59	80	76	84	80	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	457
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	9	20	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
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	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	93	84	95	117	106	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	13	7	7	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	55	47	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	9	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	93	84	95	117	106	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	13	7	7	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	55	47	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	9	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	34%	52%	57%	28%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	50%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	45%	54%	63%	44%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	57%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	51%	55%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	50%	53%	74%	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	31%	52%	-21%	58%	-27%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	55%	-10%	58%	-13%
	2018	31%	55%	-24%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	21%	54%	-33%	56%	-35%
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	54%	-13%	62%	-21%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	57%	-15%	64%	-22%
	2018	31%	57%	-26%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	61%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	52%	21%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
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	6	48	57	23	47	37	36				
ELL	28	44	56	42	51	36	45				
BLK	44	53		32	41						
HSP	32	49	55	45	53	37	50				
WHT	48	61		57	70						
FRL	32	48	56	43	53	41	51				
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	11	53	60	28	49	58	40				
ELL	30	47	57	41	34	39	62				
BLK	40	62		30	38						
HSP	33	50	53	44	40	33	70				
WHT	52	56		48	61						
FRL	34	51	60	42	41	37	71				
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	12	41	40	28	47	58	38				
ELL	18	50	57	42	50	50	65				
BLK	33			33							
HSP	21	50	53	43	51	51	72				
WHT	65	65		53	65						
FRL	26	52	50	42	51	54	72				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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
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	43
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	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 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	59
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	49
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.

Reading and Math Proficiency were the two components that showed the lowest performance. Students struggle to apply skills and strategies in grade-level appropriate texts to understand material. Students are lacking comprehension strategies to adequately understand literature and informational texts. Students are still working to decode words within the text, and gaining strategies to build their vocabulary.

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

In the 2018-2019 school year 41% of 3rd graders, 42% of 4th grade and 46% of 5th grade students were proficient in Math. Students have difficulty determining what operation(s) to utilize when reading the problem. Students lack content specific Reading skills to comprehend what information they are being given within a word problem, and what information from a word problems are unknown.

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.

Reading proficiency continues to be the greatest gap when compared to the state. Students are lacking comprehension strategies to adequately understand literature and informational texts.

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

The bottom quartile in both Reading and Mathematics as well as learning gains in Mathematics. Concentrated effort to identify the students who fell into the bottom quartile and supports that could be implemented. Also looked at how many points a student had to gain.

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

ELL
SWD

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

1. Increase Reading Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. Reading Gains
5. Math Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Continue with strengthening the core instruction so students needs can also be meet in small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Improve ELA proficiency by 10% in our subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karen Fletcher (karen.fletcher@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Focus on the core instruction so that teachers are collecting data on student's specific needs. Include formative data from iReady to look at supporting small group instruction. PLC's will be implemented in the morning so that data and information can be shared.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research has shown that effective PLC's can assist with planning.

Action Steps to Implement

Actions that will be taken are walkthorughs with feedback given by both the principal and assistant principal. Designated support will be assigned to grade level PLC's to monitor how effective they are and information will be shared during Leadership Meetings.

Person Responsible Ismael Lebron-Bravo (ismael.lebron-bravo@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- 1. School Leadership Team has created/placed students in classrooms by need**
- 2. During pre-planning teachers will be given time to plan in advance**
- 3. Members of the Leadership Team will be part of PLC's**

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.

Part of the Social Services team to assist meeting the social and emotional needs of families and students. Track any attendance concerns or behaviors before they occur. Part of the MTSS team and offer IEP counseling when appropriate. As mandated by ESSA Section 1116 meaningful activities will be conducted to provide the communication and support necessary to assist and build the capacity of all families and staff in planning and implementing effective parent and family involvement activities to improve student academic achievement and school performance. Please refer to the Parent & Family Engagement Plan for specific details.

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
Total:			\$0.00