
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Tampa Palms Elementary School

6100 TAMPA PALMS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angela Gluth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (62%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Tampa Palms Elementary School

6100 TAMPA PALMS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">45%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">76%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide all students with the opportunities to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to realize their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tampa Palms will be in the top one percent of elementary schools in the nation.

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
Lippeck, MaryAnn	Principal	<p>The principal identifies the members of the school leadership team. Leadership team meetings can include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches)
		<p>The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.
		<p>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.</p>
		<p>Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.</p>
		<p>HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Weston, Ashley	SAC Member	The SAC Chairperson will lead the SAC team in the school improvement process. Monthly meetings will be facilitated to review school-wide data and to review progress monitoring data and steps.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Angela Gluth

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.*

5

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

743

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

4

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	110	124	112	120	100	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	17	19	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	13	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 8/24/2021

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	118	115	120	126	122	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	13	8	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	118	115	120	126	122	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	13	8	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	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	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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				76%	52%	57%	73%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				72%	55%	58%	65%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	50%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				76%	54%	63%	77%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				71%	57%	62%	67%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	46%	51%	40%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				71%	50%	53%	69%	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	73%	52%	21%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	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 ELA & Math. Data pulled from the Power BI district reports.

Science Baseline & Mid Year were used. In the spring, the students took the state test for Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	67	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	48	55
	Students With Disabilities	61	99	97
	English Language Learners	51	63	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	54	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	22	34
	Students With Disabilities	52	64	76
	English Language Learners	27	38	53
	Grade 2			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	69	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	45	45
	Students With Disabilities	81	88	94
	English Language Learners	51	59	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	56	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	26	45
	Students With Disabilities	67	83	87
	English Language Learners	13	8	29

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	71	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	57	60
	Students With Disabilities	92	96	90
	English Language Learners	19	38	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	49	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	80	93
	Students With Disabilities	48	64	70
	English Language Learners	17	36	44

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	61	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	38	40
	Students With Disabilities	77	63	76
	English Language Learners	34	38	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	58	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	36	40
	Students With Disabilities	53	66	62
	English Language Learners	13	38	38

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66	77	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	60	58
	Students With Disabilities	100	100	95
	English Language Learners	76	74	83
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	64	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	44	59
	Students With Disabilities	73	79	89
	English Language Learners	50	83	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	61	72	71
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA
	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	27	25	33	35	31	33	21				
ELL	75	88	80	80	83		90				
ASN	89	82		91	79		92				
BLK	48	43	27	38	52	46	42				
HSP	66	69		63	69		66				
MUL	68			64							
WHT	76	61		79	77		73				
FRL	48	49	36	43	53	38	51				
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	37	57	44	46	58	58	38				
ELL	68	70	39	74	79	63	52				

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
ASN	93	79		95	92		95				
BLK	52	53	45	46	53	48	43				
HSP	71	76	62	64	62	54	55				
MUL	71	69		71	62						
WHT	77	72	25	82	70	46	76				
FRL	58	66	47	60	61	48	55				
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	40	45	24	56	42	27	38				
ELL	59	65	44	75	65	58	36				
ASN	94	84		96	91		88				
BLK	45	52	41	46	40	15	41				
HSP	62	57	25	68	57	38	59				
MUL	69	63		67	58		60				
WHT	79	61	50	85	68	61	77				
FRL	59	56	40	64	56	38	52				

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	64
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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	82
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	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	65
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	73
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	49
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?

Math proficiency has decreased based on the 2019 and 2021 FSA Math results.

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

Math proficiency and math gains for the lowest 25%. ELA lowest 25%.

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

Loss of instructional time due to COVID and e-learning were factors that negatively impacted student achievement from March 2020 forward. Acceleration strategies will be used to increase student understanding of the core concepts.

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

From 2018 to 2019 an improvement in overall ELA FSA scores were made (73 to 76 percent 3+). Math BQ student also showed an improvement from 2018-2019. In moving forward into the 2020 school year, under COVID regulations, many challenges occurred. A focus on acceleration strategies will be used to provide academic support in areas of need.

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

Small group instruction and solid core instruction assisted students in making gains.

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

Collaborative planning sessions will be used to analyze student data and trends. Teams will use the instructional guides and standards to determine small group instruction for acceleration. Solid core instruction will take place that is aligned to the standards. Learning tasks will be aligned and provide opportunities for students to think critically about content.

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.

Professional development to ELA teachers is planned for foundational skills and comprehension. Training is provided by FLDOE trainers and vetted content. Professional development on acceleration strategies in both math and ELA will be conducted.

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

Content area leads receive regular and on-going PD that is brought back to the school and shared with all staff. PSLT and PLC meetings will be used to focus on student achievement and content lesson implementation.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the historical data, an instructional focus needs to address the discrepancy between the percent of students in the bottom quartile who make learning gains in both ELA and Math. The effective use of standards-based instruction along with acceleration strategies will close the achievement gap for students. Standards-based planning and instruction will allow teachers to clearly communicate the standards being taught and what students must know and do to show understanding of the standard. The use of acceleration strategies will allow for students to acquire the necessary skills to be more successful with current, on-level content.

Measurable Outcome: Through the use of standards-based planning and acceleration strategies the bottom quartile subgroups will increase by 5 percentage points respectfully.

Monitoring: Monthly PSLT meetings will be held to review data points along with bi-monthly leadership team meetings. Data findings will be reviewed with grade level teams. Classroom walkthroughs will take place to ensure core instruction is aligned to standards and acceleration practices are implemented with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: MaryAnn Lippek (maryann.lippeck@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PSLT will continue to collaborate with grade level teams to identify students in need of additional supports and which supports may improve learning. i-Ready and other district approved computer based programs for ELA & Math will be used to enhance instruction for content needing remediation. Small group instruction during the school day and as part of an extended learning program will be used in conjunction with research-based materials/books to provide intensive reading support. Solid core instruction tightly aligned to the grade level standards/expectations will be used in daily instruction. Student learning will be made visible (1.44 effect size) Direct instruction will be used in core and small groups (.59 effect size) metacognitive strategies, questioning, cooperative learning opportunities, and integrated curriculum opportunities will be utilized (effect size ranging from .69-.39) Feedback that is timely and moves instruction forward will be used (.73 effect size) Acceleration strategies will be used as needed (.88 effect size)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PSLT will support teacher's instruction and provide feedback on alignment. iReady is a research based program approved by the district and available to all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a schedule that allows the PSLT to collaborate with grade level/content teams on a regular basis.
2. Create a system/schedule to closely monitor student achievement & gains.
3. Use walkthrough data to provide targeted feedback to teachers in relation to standards-based instruction and acceleration practices.
4. Provide and communicate PD offerings in the focus areas.
5. Small group learning opportunities such as ELP will be used to extend learning opportunities.

Person Responsible MaryAnn Lippek (maryann.lippeck@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 today's society students are exposed to negative talk and harmful comments on social media and through online gaming platforms. Students need continued education on the impact of these harmful statements. Students often times express frustration by blurting out a statement that can be viewed as harmful and inappropriate.

Decrease the number of students making harmful or threatening comments. Tampa Palms is continuing to work on educating students on the effects of harmful/hurtful statements and how to express feelings of anger or sadness in a constructive manner. Programs such as Act Now and guidance lessons are used to address this goal.

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.

Tampa Palms uses a variety of strategies to foster a positive learning community. Each year prior to assigning students to classes, parent input forms are distributed. This provides families with an opportunity to share with the school their child's learning needs and the teaching style they are hoping for from their child's teacher. This also allows school administration to make effective matches with placement. The role of the teacher is critical in establishing and maintaining a positive learning environment. Teachers are tasked with forming high expectations for all students and communicating those expectations out to stakeholders.

Tampa Palms utilizes the Good Choice Pledge to set a positive tone for learning. The pledge is posted in all learning environments around campus. It is shared with all families. It is reviewed and recited each day on the morning show. It is the foundation of all of our work. It provides a set of clear expectations and allows for students to analyze their behavior/choices in order to make a better choice in the future.

The guidance team provides opportunities for students to be a part of small groups as needed. Classroom guidance lessons are used to teach and maintain a positive learning environment.

Reward and recognition programs help encourage positive behaviors. Tampa Palms has a weekly Super Star Student recognition program along with a monthly Citizen of the Month program. At the end of the grading period, students who consistently made good choices are recognized.

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

The principal and administrative team share out the expectations for all stakeholders. Teachers use the Good Choice Pledge as the foundation for creating a positive classroom environment. The guidance team implement classroom lessons using district approved resources and staff created lessons to address the goal.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			4261 - Tampa Palms Elementary School	Other		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: SAC will use funds donated to the school or gained through fundraising to acquire additional technology to support student learning and/or supplemental instructional resources. Amount allocated will depend on donations and fundraising. An estimate of \$10,000 will be determined as a baseline. SAC will vote on expenditures.</i>			
					Total:	\$10,000.00