

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Egypt Lake Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Egypt Lake Elementary School

6707 N GLEN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Holly Magaditsch

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: B (57%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Egypt Lake Elementary School

6707 N GLEN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	86%
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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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.

All students will be provided equitable experiences which build their foundation for intellectual and social growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering Learners for Life Long Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	Principal	The Principal is responsible for the overall management of the school and the academic success of the students.
Magaditsch, Holly	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for the overall management of the school and the academic success of students.
Rombach, Devin	Teacher, K-12	Teacher is responsible for teaching first grade as well as co-chairing SAC.
Neel, Haleigh	Teacher, K-12	Teacher is responsible for teaching first grade as well as co-chairing SAC.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 9/20/2020, Holly Magaditsch

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

432

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

0

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	63	64	55	72	73	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	1	14	9	9	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	5	1	0	0	0	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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

2020-21 - 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	55	65	65	72	71	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	9	16	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	55	65	65	72	71	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	9	16	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				57%	52%	57%	55%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	55%	58%	61%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	50%	53%	54%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	54%	63%	52%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	57%	62%	54%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	46%	51%	40%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	50%	53%	24%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	64%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

3rd, 4th, 5th: Math Monthly, iReady Reading and Math, Achieve 3000, Formative Assessments, Running Records

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	50	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	49	70
	Students With Disabilities	30	31	48
	English Language Learners	27	34	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	41	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	88	96	66
	Students With Disabilities	68	86	98
	English Language Learners	86	94	98

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	47	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	43	53
	Students With Disabilities	46	47	49
	English Language Learners	28	31	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	31	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	27	46
	Students With Disabilities	15	38	65
	English Language Learners	50	78	90
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56	64	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	65	74
	Students With Disabilities	44	53	60
	English Language Learners	30	41	51
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	35	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	36	54
	Students With Disabilities	29	41	48
	English Language Learners	8	19	39

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	55	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	56	67
	Students With Disabilities	57	56	78
	English Language Learners	34	39	48
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	33	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	32	56
	Students With Disabilities	29	31	35
	English Language Learners	13	21	41
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	63	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	63	67
	Students With Disabilities	48	59	61
	English Language Learners	38	50	57
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	39	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	39	52
	Students With Disabilities	24	39	47
	English Language Learners	10	24	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42	53	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	53	42
	Students With Disabilities	43	49	42
	English Language Learners	36	47	42

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	33	77		38	80		21				
ELL	59	70		61	68		40				
BLK	38			57							
HSP	61	63	73	64	69	73	45				
WHT	64			71							
FRL	58	69	80	63	75	79	43				
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	58		39	45	45	18				
ELL	57	67	50	57	55	57	49				
BLK	33	63		47	63		50				
HSP	60	64	52	59	52	50	52				
WHT	71	85		82	77						
FRL	54	65	60	59	55	58	47				
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	31	58	42	31	35	23	7				
ELL	55	64	59	50	49	30	22				
BLK	40	68		33	58		8				
HSP	60	63	59	52	54	42	28				
WHT	50	42		75	50						
FRL	54	60	54	50	53	38	21				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	526
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students make gains in bottom quartile and gains. Lower levels of student proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

There is a need to push proficiency by strengthening core instruction related to grade level standards and by having data driven small groups based on student needs.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Student gains and proficiency will increase when teachers use individual student data to set goals, plan differentiated learning tasks based on the individual's point of need and regularly monitor student progress towards proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Bottom quartile growth and gains.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Small group instruction by academic coaches.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Common planning sessions, data chats, small group planning and disaggregation, MTSS/PSLT

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Differentiation, knowledge of standards, Professional Learning Communities, Data

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Staff (Reading Coach/Math Coach/Rtl Facilitator), planning structures, data chat documents, student goal setting.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Classroom walkthrough data showed a lack of small group instruction last year. There were times instructional decisions were made without consulting student data or grade level trends. Student learning will be positively impacted when student data is used to plan effective small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome: 47% of third graders demonstrated ELA proficiency on FSA in 2018-19 school year. This year, 70% of fifth graders will demonstrate ELA proficiency on the FSA in the 20-21 school year.

Monitoring: Iready weekly goals will be set with students. Students will receive small group instruction based on Iready data trends where reading strategies will be used.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Holly Magaditsch (holly.magaditsch@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Iready weekly goals will be set with students. Students will receive small group instruction based on Iready data trends where reading strategies will be used.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers can alter the Iready pathways to assign additional practice as well as teacher assigned lessons.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reading coach will conduct weekly planning sessions in grades K-5.
2. District resources will be used during these weekly planning sessions.
3. Lesson planning will include Iready small group lessons.
3. Iready progress will be printed each Thursday afternoon and notations made by administration.

Person Responsible: Holly Magaditsch (holly.magaditsch@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In using SafeSchoolsforAlex.org Egypt Lake Elementary was listed as having high violent incidences. In order to work with students and keep our school safe for learning we will implement the Positive Behavior Supports System in the classrooms. We will also have our Student Services team available for counseling and lunch bunch sessions. We will also have a monthly character trait, classroom guidance, and classroom team building experiences to keep our school safe.

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.

PBIS expectations are encouraged and communicated in classrooms and common areas. Points are awarded and students can purchase incentives at the class and school level. The guidance counselor plans small group guidance lessons. Weekly positive referrals are recognized, as well as monthly character celebrations. The social worker plans attendance incentives and manages individual attendance contracts.

Parents are invited to be a part of SAC and Parent/Family engagement events. All communication is provided in Spanish and English.

Community partners donate supplies to our students such as Advent Hospital Carrollwood and Tampa Bay Harvest.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Jessica Vazquez- Parent and Family Engagement
Jasmin Ruger- Guidance Counselor
Marissa Mitchell- Social Worker

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