Woodbridge Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Woodbridge Elementary School

8301 WOODBRIDGE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ana "Victoria" Morse

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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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

Woodbridge Elementary School

8301 WOODBRIDGE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[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	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

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

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.

Show our Wildcat PRIDE by:
P- Be a Problem Solver
R- Take Responsibility for my actions
I- Invest care in myself and others.
D- Show Determination to reach my goals.
E- Give my best Effort.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building a Foundation for the Future.

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
Jacobsen Capps, Sarah	Principal	Principal- member
Gonsowski, Kelsy	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Elementary Instruction
Chacon, Claudia	Instructional Coach	ELL Resource Teacher
Germain, Jill	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair
Valverde, Miriam	Instructional Coach	Reading Resource

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ana "Victoria" Morse

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.*
2

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
12

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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	80	99	98	86	91	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	24	17	14	20	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
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	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	24	18	15	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	41	48	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	5	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	24	18	15	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	41	48	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	5	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	

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	47%	52%	57%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	55%	58%	66%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	50%	53%	58%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	54%	63%	54%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	62%	66%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	46%	51%	56%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	50%	53%	53%	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	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%	
	2018	36%	53%	-17%	57%	-21%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%	
	2018	30%	55%	-25%	56%	-26%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%	
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		22%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%	
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	62%	-16%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	50%	57%	-7%	64%	-14%	
	2018	35%	57%	-22%	62%	-27%	
Same Grade Comparison		15%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%	
	2018	45%	54%	-9%	61%	-16%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		6%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	36%	51%	-15%	53%	-17%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
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	36	48	29	41	53	38	40				
ELL	36	48	40	38	44	27	7				
BLK	47	50		37	50						
HSP	44	54	43	47	50	27	37				
MUL	64			82							
WHT	52	56		52	58						
FRL	47	54	42	49	52	30	44				
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	28	47	58	34	36	20	35				
ELL	32	45	56	46	34	31	56				
BLK	42	53		39	56						
HSP	47	56	59	53	48	33	63				
MUL	36			45							
WHT	71	67		26	45						
FRL	49	57	53	50	49	35	59				
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	17	31	36	13	38						
ELL	34	70	67	45	61	61	47				
BLK	73			73							
HSP	49	63	50	51	66	56	50				
WHT	57	75		48	75						
FRL	52	65	57	52	63	54	48				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	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	46
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	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
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	55
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	48
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.

ELL Reading proficiency at 38%; Need for teacher professional development in scaffolding strategies for English Language Learners

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

Students with Disabilities Learning Gains in Math showed great decrease; Shift in model of service to SWD and teacher knowledge in content and strategy impacted gains
Science decrease aligned with other data for that cohort, Vacant Science Resource position

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.

ELL Reading Proficiency- 3% gap; Need for teacher professional development in strategies and scaffolding with English Language Learners; Master scheduling of ELL more individualized

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

Same cohort gains across all grades and subjects, large cohort gains in 4th grade Math and 5th grade ELA; Student/Teacher assignments and use of instructional coaches impacted these gain; Implementation of Monthly Math model and data based decision impacted gains based on 19-20 district data

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

1) Reading proficiency for English Language Learners
2) Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities

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

1. Increase Reading Proficiency for ELL
2. Increase Learning Gains for SWD in Reading
3. Increase Learning Gains for SWD in Math
4. Increase Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data based decision making to drive instructional practice through the use of formal and informal formative assessment
Measurable Outcome:	43% Reading Proficiency for ELL 47% Reading Proficiency for SWD
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on John Hattie's work on effect size, we will focus on formative assessment: Math: Utilize the monthly math assessments and data chat model to determine individual student needs Reading: Well planned, intentional guided reading utilizing research based practices and intervention (IReady, SIPPS, Achieve3000)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Gains seen during 19-20 using this model; Allows for ongoing data to monitor individual student gains and determine shifts in instructional practice; Coaching and planning support system in place with content experts

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning sessions with Instructional Coaches that include data analysis and the determination of specific next steps to meet differentiated student needs

Person Responsible	Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

Scheduling for individual students (English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities) based on student data and teacher strengths

Person Responsible	Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

Targeted walkthrough cycles with specific look-fors on a weekly basis by members of the Academic Leadership Team; Review and adjust in weekly meetings

Person Responsible	Kelsy Gonsowski (kelsy.gonsowski@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The model described was working very well during the 19-20 school year and will continue with some items more targeted and refined. The Monthly Math model was new to our teachers and students and will be implemented with more fidelity and impact for individual students. Our teachers are receiving training on new Reading resources during the summer. Collaborative planning with ELA coaches will provide support in how to best use the many resources to meet student needs. Coaching cycles with individual teachers will be scheduled and their impact on student achievement monitored. For ELL, the Academic Leadership Team will write a more specific plan to ensure the goal is met. This will involve identifying teachers strong in ELL strategies and setting up models for peer support. For SWD, since April we have been gathering student data and scheduling student by student. Several PD sessions have been held with VE teachers and area ESE Supervisors. Reading curriculum has been chosen based on student data and PD to begin the year has been scheduled.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The vision and mission were developed with all stakeholders during the transition to the 19-20 school year. All stakeholder groups chose to keep this vision and mission The school compact aligns with the Vision and Mission. In review of current SCIP data, during May 2020 faculty Zoom, next steps to increase teacher voice in decision making were shared. During the 19-20 school year, a Student SAC was implemented to provide additional opportunities for student voice and will be continued. Steering has been implemented, beginning with frequent meetings and moving to monthly when the group decides. Monthly team leader meetings with the APEI are also in place.

Parents were surveyed before eLearning and during eLearning. These results have been reviewed and will be considered in scheduled SAC, PTA and other events for parents and families. The common use of Edsby, and now to Canvas, will assist in increasing parent communication.

Our Student Services department continued the shift to a Social Emotional Learning approach in how time is used and resources and supports are provided. Additional training will be given to staff on this approach and on restorative practices.

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
		Total:	$0.00