

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Tampa Bay Boulevard Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Tampa Bay Boulevard Elementary School

3111 W TAMPA BAY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Perez

Start Date for this Principal: 11/2/2009

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 White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Tampa Bay Boulevard Elementary School

3111 W TAMPA BAY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>93%</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>95%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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 Tampa Bay Boulevard Elementary students will become successful, responsible, life-long learners through effective, rigorous and differentiated instruction designed for the 21st century learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Students for Life!

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
Vinueza, Glenda	Principal	The principal is responsible for the overall management of the school and the continued academic success of all students.
Perez, Michelle	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for the overall management of the school and the academic success of all students.
Moncrief, Heather	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach is responsible for planning with teams in ELA instruction and implementation of lessons with fidelity and analyzing school wide data to look for trends within our areas of strengths and weakness.
Rivera, Marilyn	Parent Engagement Liaison	The Parent Engagement Liaison is responsible for providing resources and tools to parents and teachers in order to strengthen the parent/ teacher communication and student success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/2/2009, Michelle Perez

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

493

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

3

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

4

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	67	77	81	67	59	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	23	12	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	32	30	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	21	16	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

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	76	82	83	65	94	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	23	23	18	16	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	

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	76	82	83	65	94	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	23	23	18	16	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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 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				50%	52%	57%	43%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	55%	58%	43%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	50%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	54%	63%	48%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	57%	62%	41%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	46%	51%	25%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	50%	53%	45%	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	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Diagnostic data was used as the progress monitoring tools for ELA and Math. The District Baseline and Mid-Year Assessment was used for Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	30	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	22	45
	Students With Disabilities	25	20	26
	English Language Learners	5	11	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	17	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	17	35
	Students With Disabilities	13	11	11
	English Language Learners	5	9	22

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	34	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	33	49
	Students With Disabilities	28	34	37
	English Language Learners	13	26	37
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	12	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	11	28
	Students With Disabilities	4	12	26
	English Language Learners	6	3	18

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	58	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	56	63
	Students With Disabilities	33	48	46
	English Language Learners	20	28	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	120	20	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	21	48
	Students With Disabilities	17	30	43
	English Language Learners	0	8	35

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	27	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	26	43
	Students With Disabilities	15	23	26
	English Language Learners	3	3	19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	26	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	24	42
	Students With Disabilities	12	22	33
	English Language Learners	0	6	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	40	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	39	41
	Students With Disabilities	12	23	23
	English Language Learners	0	0	8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	25	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	27	44
	Students With Disabilities	12	21	40
	English Language Learners	0	8	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	47.5	39.07	
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.5	41.88	
	Students With Disabilities	33.95	28.18	
	English Language Learners	23.5	20.9	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	25	33	55	28	33	30	29				
ELL	43	56	69	37	42	42	23				
BLK	34			28							
HSP	55	64	64	49	48	42	40				
FRL	52	64	68	45	47	39	37				
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	22	45	57	35	58	57	13				
ELL	38	55	66	46	58	45	22				
BLK	39	46	50	33	46	36	35				
HSP	52	56	61	52	61	46	39				
WHT	59	60		53	67						
FRL	50	54	58	48	59	45	37				
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	21	38	42	30	38	22	39				
ELL	28	46	43	40	45	28	38				
BLK	33	30	17	35	32	23	38				
HSP	44	45	41	50	41	21	48				
WHT	50	46		55	69						
FRL	42	42	35	46	38	25	44				

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	52
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
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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 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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
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?

In the area of Science, FSA achievement data has declined for the past 3 years. In the area of Math there were declines in all grade levels in achievement levels, gains and bottom quartile. Math did not show adequate progress in grade 1 in all subgroups. In ELA, FSA data and progress monitoring data showed an increase in all grade levels but did vary within the subgroups. In grades 1-3, ESE students are not making sufficient progress in ELA.

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

Science is an area of need based off of state assessments with only 32% of students meeting proficiency.

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

In the area of Science, ensuring the fidelity of instruction at all grade levels, hands on learning was limited, and planning using available data sources. In the area of Math, there was limited use of manipulatives for students to work concretely for foundational skills and collaboration.

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

ELA overall showed the most improvement. ELA gains showed the most improvement with an 8 point gain from the previous tested year.

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

In ELA there was consistency in common planning, departmentalization has allowed teachers to refine craft, deep data analysis to design targeted instruction. Achieve 3000 and i-Ready was implemented with fidelity.

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

To accelerate learning, we will implement purposeful and intentional planning based off of current student data to provide just in time targeted support through small group instruction. Student literacy profiles will help target instruction.

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.

In ELA, foundational skills and vocabulary building training for K-2 found in the Best Standards. In grades 3-5, building vocabulary and embedding foundational skills training.

In Math, teachers will participate in Application of Data within the Math Classroom Part 1.

Learning walks where teachers observe one another with side by side coaching in ELA, Math and Science.

Engage bi-weekly district support to provide mini PD sessions after school based off district assessment data.

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

Fidelity in common planning to follow up with coaching cycles, non-evaluative feedback from instructional coaches and administration.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Only 32% of the students are proficient on the State FSSA Science Assessment.

Measurable Outcome: There will be at least a 5% increase in proficiency on the State FSSA Science Assessment.

Monitoring: Monitoring fidelity of science instruction, long term investigations, and common planning with informal and formal observations. District support will plan with 5th grade teachers on a bi-weekly basis using current data and provide PD opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Long term investigations, science journals, hands on activities and experiments and peer to peer teaching through collaborative groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our data shows a need for acceleration in all sub groups to increase proficiency across all grade levels. Targeting instruction based on student data will help increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will monitor science instruction with formal and informal observations. The Science District Resource Teacher will plan with 5th grade teachers to enhance science instruction. The Science contact at our school site will encourage science instruction and increased STEM through the use of resources, Science Olympics and the Science Fair across all grade levels.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School wide attendance is below 80% overall with a significant number of individual student having less than 90%.

Measurable Outcome: All students will have a 90% or above attendance rate.

Monitoring: Attendance will be monitored by the Assistant Principal, School Social Worker and teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Perez (michelles.perez@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies will include:
 - incentives for students who arrive on time and are in daily attendance.
 - communication to parents at set number of absences using a tiered system.
 - social work referral services

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing student attendance will increase the number of hours students are instructed.

Action Steps to Implement

The Assistant Principal and Social Worker will work closely with the teachers to encourage positive attendance at school. There will be frequent communication between all parties to enforce attendance and thus increasing student instruction at school.

Person Responsible Michelle Perez (michelles.perez@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Based on the data, 44% of our students were proficient on FSA Mathematics.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

We will increase proficiency and learning gains by at least 5% on the FSA Mathematics Assessment.

Monitoring:

We will monitor student progress through the use of monthly assessments and iReady Diagnostic/Growth Monitoring.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Teachers will implement the following:

- establish math goals to focus learning
- use and connect mathematical representations through the CRA model
- facilitate mathematical discourse with the use of purposeful questioning
- build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding
- accelerated learning

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Our data shows a need for acceleration in all sub groups to increase proficiency across all grade levels. Targeting instruction based on student data will help increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Common Planning with fidelity check ups

**Person
Responsible**

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Acceleration PD

**Person
Responsible**

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Monthly Assessment PLC's

**Person
Responsible**

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Learning Walks

**Person
Responsible**

Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data, 52% of students were proficient in ELA FSA. This was an increase in 2 percentage points from the previous data point in grades 3-5. 64% of students made gains in ELA and 67% made gains in the bottom quartile. We still have 48% of our students who are not meeting proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: On FSA in 2022, 57% of students will be proficient. We will increase in all subgroups as well.

Monitoring: We will monitor student progress through monthly assessments and Iready Diagnostics aligned to student goals. Teachers will analyze data to modify and design instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will implement the following strategies:
 - establish ela goals to focus learning (students and teachers)
 - facilitate meaningful ela discourse through purposeful questioning
 - accelerate learning will be implemented

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our data shows a need for acceleration in all sub groups to increase proficiency across all grade levels. Targeting instruction based on student data will help increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Common planning with occur weekly with fidelity checks.

Person Responsible Heather Moncrief (heather.moncrief@hcps.net)

Acceleration PD for the staff.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Monthly Assessment PLC's

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data, 52% of students were proficient in ELA FSA. This was an increase in 2 percentage points from the previous data point in grades 3-5. 64% of students made gains in ELA and 67% made gains in the bottom quartile. We still have 48% of our students who are not meeting proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of 3-5 grade students scoring at a Level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA assessment will increase to 57% as measured by FSA ELA.

Monitoring: Monitor the implementation of the use of the checks for understanding in the classrooms. Provide feedback to teachers on the overall effectiveness of this strategy on student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Develop checks for understanding and utilize student artifacts that serve as data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In 2021, the data showed in grades 3,4, and 5, proficiency was less than 50%. The improvement strategy of developing checks for understanding and utilize student artifacts as data will increase proficiency, resulting in improved student academic performance in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

Adapt current Professional Learning Community Sessions to be a place for teachers and school leadership to review student work and set criteria for levels of student understanding.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@hcps.net)

Utilize the demonstration of learning tasks (k-2) and/or the possible tasks (3-5) from the instructional guides as a foundation for the creation of checks for understanding. Take time at each PLC to create and commit to at least one task per week per grade level to utilize as a check for understanding.

Person Responsible Glenda Vinueza (glenda.vinueza@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.

Tampa Bay Boulevard reported .3 incidents per 100 students falling into a low category when comparing to all elementary schools. The school ranked #473 out of 1395 elementary schools statewide. Administration will monitor behavior incidences on a weekly basis and through PSLT.

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.

Each year, we begin with high expectation not only for students for the adults. The year begins with a team building activity where the faculty and staff are able to engage in a fun and interactive activity that promotes camaraderie and team work. Each month, Administration, PTA and the Social Committee work together to create appreciation opportunities for all faculty and staff.

Teachers engage students in the classroom in meaningful activities and model values of trust, respect and high expectations to build a positive environment in the classrooms. Students set goals for their learning progress and are recognized for their efforts to meet their goals. Some examples include, awards ceremonies, i-Ready glow parties, ice cream treats, etc. The school support team provides resources and SEL strategies to students to help students recognize mindfulness, resolve conflicts, and work on improving positive relationships.

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

Our Parent Family Engagement Plan includes components to build relationships with our families and community. Communication is our priority to develop positive relationships with the families. We engage families daily with student planners, open house, quarterly conference nights, curriculum nights, parent links, awards assemblies and school publications. PTA provides means and opportunities for families, students and staff to engage in fun, friendly events.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------