

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Wimauma Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>21</b> |

# Wimauma Elementary School

5709 HICKMAN ST, Wimauma, FL 33598

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Lebron Lebron Bravo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (47%)<br>2017-18: C (48%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>21</b> |

## Wimauma Elementary School

5709 HICKMAN ST, Wimauma, FL 33598

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 89%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 92%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                 | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Lebron-Bravo, Ismael | Principal           | To monitor, contribute data, and provide suggestions to instructional lessons provided by the staff. Ongoing feedback is given to all staff members. Also to handle the day to day operations of managing a school. |
| Fletcher, Karen      | Assistant Principal | Assist the principal with instruction, observation, and operations of the school.   |
| Kudia, Kelly         | SAC Member          |   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Lebron Lebron Bravo

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

1

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

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

25

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

501

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.

2

## 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                              | 66          | 68 | 82 | 92 | 71 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 465   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 22          | 27 | 17 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 126   |
| 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 FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 19 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 11 | 18 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 61    |
| 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           | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

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 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| 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

Sunday 8/29/2021

#### 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               | 59          | 80 | 76 | 84 | 80 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 457   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 17          | 12 | 9  | 20 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**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               | 59          | 80 | 76 | 84 | 80 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 457   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 28 | 15 | 17 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 97    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 1  | 0  | 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 ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |

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

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

**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           | 3 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |
| 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             |        |          |       | 34%    | 52%      | 57%   | 35%    | 52%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 50%    | 55%      | 58%   | 51%    | 52%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 56%    | 50%      | 53%   | 60%    | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 45%    | 54%      | 63%   | 43%    | 55%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 54%    | 57%      | 62%   | 42%    | 57%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 41%    | 46%      | 51%   | 37%    | 44%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 52%    | 50%      | 53%   | 71%    | 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 | 31%    | 52%      | -21%                       | 58%   | -27%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 45%    | 55%      | -10%                       | 58%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -31%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 21%    | 54%      | -33%                       | 56%   | -35%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -45%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 54%      | -13%                       | 62%   | -21%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 42%    | 57%      | -15%                       | 64%   | -22%                    |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -41%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 46%    | 54%      | -8%                        | 60%   | -14%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -42%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 51%      | 0%                         | 53%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We are using data from the iReady ELA/Math for grade 1-5. In Science, we are using the district formative data that was given through the 2020-2021 school year.

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 12%  | 33%    | 64%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 12%  | 31%    | 63%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 13%    | 43%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 21%    | 50%    |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 9%   | 28%    | 51%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 9%   | 28%    | 51%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 13%  | 13%    | 14%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 5%   | 21%    | 27%    |

| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 12%  | 32%    | 59%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 16%  | 39%    | 68%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 9%     | 14%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 11%  | 19%    | 36%    |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 1%   | 14%    | 39%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 14%    | 40%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 7%     | 30%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 4%     | 25%    |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 32%  | 34%    | 68%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 28%  | 34%    | 47%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 21%  | 26%    | 22%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 8%     | 20%    |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 1%   | 17%    | 33%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 17%    | 34%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4%   | 26%    | 20%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 8%     | 20%    |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 4               |                            |        |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 10%    | 13%    | 31%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 9%     | 13%    | 30%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 9%     | 13%    | 35%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 11%    | 9%     | 9%     |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 4%     | 8%     | 37%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 4%     | 8%     | 37%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%     | 0%     | 25%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%     | 9%     | 18%    |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
| Grade 5               |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 15%    | 22%    | 30%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 14%    | 19%    | 28%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 14%    | 27%    | 30%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 8%     | 22%    | 41%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 8%     | 20%    | 39%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 9%     | 27%    | 40%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 37%    | 50.34% | N/A    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 35.5%  | 47.5%  | N/A    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 47.50% | 59.43% | N/A    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 9.10%  | 7.11%  | N/A    |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| <b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b> |
| SWD  | 14              | 10            |                    | 12               | 15             |                     | 27              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 25              | 31            | 28                 | 28               | 33             | 44                  | 40              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 32              | 35            | 25                 | 32               | 34             | 45                  | 49              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 14              |               |                    | 40               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 31              | 35            | 23                 | 32               | 34             | 41                  | 49              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| SWD  | 6               | 48            | 57                 | 23               | 47             | 37                  | 36              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 28              | 44            | 56                 | 42               | 51             | 36                  | 45              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 44              | 53            |                    | 32               | 41             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 32              | 49            | 55                 | 45               | 53             | 37                  | 50              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 48              | 61            |                    | 57               | 70             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 32              | 48            | 56                 | 43               | 53             | 41                  | 51              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| SWD  | 11              | 53            | 60                 | 28               | 49             | 58                  | 40              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 30              | 47            | 57                 | 41               | 34             | 39                  | 62              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 40              | 62            |                    | 30               | 38             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 33              | 50            | 53                 | 44               | 40             | 33                  | 70              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 52              | 56            |                    | 48               | 61             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 34              | 51            | 60                 | 42               | 41             | 37                  | 71              |                |                  |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |      |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 38   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 5    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 61   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 306  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |      |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 16  |
| 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                                      | 36  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| 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                                |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 39  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | YES |
| 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   | 27  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 38  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| 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?

When reviewing the 2018-2019 FSA data and comparing it to 2020-2021, the level of proficiency in ELA decreased 3 points (34%-31%). In Math, there was a decrease of 12 points (45%-33%). ELA Gains had a decrease of 16 points and ELA Bottom Quartile had a decrease of 33 points. In Math gains, there was a decrease of 20 points and the bottom quartile remained the same. Science decreased by 3 points from the previous time the assessment was given.

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

The data component that showed the greatest need for improvement is in the area of Reading and Math. Students are struggling to achieve proficiency and in the past we were able to make points in gains and bottom quartile.

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

Reading showed the greatest decline. Students missed six months of school due the mandatory lockdown and the district moved into remote learning. As a school, we have a large number of students who come from homes where English is not the primary language used. Either parents speak Spanish or a dialect from Mexico or Central America. Students may have not had access in technology and support at home to assist with their learning.

As a school we need to implement a common planning protocol to ensure all lessons focus on grade level standards and provide teachers with opportunity to actively monitor student progress.

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

The component that showed the most improvement would be in Reading, especially with regards to Phonics and Phonological Awareness.



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

SIPPS has been provided by the district and used in whole group instruction with students in the primary grades (K-2).

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

Select planning tools to support teachers with the effective planning of core-whole group text planning and small group lessons. Through the use of the tools, a clear connection with the target and task alignment will be built, and teachers will develop and align the tasks students will complete to demonstrate their learning. These tasks will include short responses, collaborative questions, and collaborative strategies that can make learning visible.

**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.**

Every Monday two grade levels will meet (primary/intermediate) to have collaborative planning. By allowing the planning to occur teachers are no longer in isolation and notice trends and how to address needs. Instructional priorities will be created and used by administration to monitor instruction. Feedback should reflect what is captured from the instructional priorities.

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

Two classrooms will be created and house the data in the areas of Reading and Math. Students will be tracked based off of iReady, PMA's that are given five times, and Math Monthly's. PLC's with support staff and district personal every Mondays with a primary and intermediate grade levels

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Instructional Coaching should be individualized, time-sensitive, context-specific, and focused on skills. Will help teachers with effective instructional strategies, new ideas, and provide feedback that can be non-formative. Can lead to conversations that assist teachers in analyzing data and applying the data to strengthen instruction  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | On the Spring 2022 FSA, we would like to have a 10 point increase in Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile which will lead to increase of students being able to reach proficiency. We would also like to see the 10 point increase in the Mathematics portion of the FSA with regards to the Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Progress monitoring will occur with the growth monitoring of iReady, use of the PMA's that are given by the district, and Math Monthly's.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Ismael Lebron-Bravo (ismael.lebron-bravo@hcps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Hire a Response to Intervention (RtI) Facilitator who will assist in the academic interventions in Mathematics and Reading. Will assist school administrators and staff in developing individual, class, and school-wide interventions, including data collection and analysis. Attend monthly PLC's and professional development on the RTI process and assist teachers in the MTSS process. Reading Coach who will assist in planning and conducting in-service training on site. Reading Coach will model effective reading and assessment practices at the site. Coaching and modeling will occur weekly with collecting and analyzing data on a monthly basis. They will meet weekly with teacher in grades 3-5 to plan effective lessons to meet the needs of students in grades 3-5 particular. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | According to Jim Knight, research associate and the director of Instructional Coaching Institute at Kansas University; By offering support, feedback, and intensive, individualized professional learning, coaching promises to be a better way to improve instruction in schools. Indeed, preliminary research suggests that effective coaching programs make a difference.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Establish a common time for each grade to plan lessons with one of the coaches. Invited and included in the common planning could be ELL, ESE, Migrant, ELA, coaches and administrators. This common planning time would occur at a set time weekly and focus on lesson development, which is a separate time than PLCs. However, the teachers would be provided data in the PLC to support their core instruction planning. This data will include iReady, PMA, screener and in-class formative assessments.

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA scores; 29% of 3rd graders, 30% of 4th graders, and 29% of 5th graders scored at proficiency. Per the state, proficiency is a students scoring a level 3 or higher. During the Spring of the 2019-2020 school, students did not have face to face instruction due to the pandemic and having to transition into virtual learning for the remainder of the year. Many of our families did not have access to appropriate technology or any understanding of remote learning. When the 2020-2021 school year started, several of the students in grades 3-5 started with remote learning and transitioned by the end of the fall into face to face. Students lacked the targeted small group instruction they would have received if they all had be on site.

**Measurable Outcome:** Percentage of students in grades 3 through 5 achieving a level 3 or higher on the ELA portion of the FSA will increase to 50%.

**Monitoring:** This will be monitored with the PMA's that will be given 5 times through the year. Also data collected from walkthroughs that will be based off the instructional priorities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ismael Lebron-Bravo (ismael.lebron-bravo@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The Reading Coach with support from district DRT's will assist with PLC/Planning. A primary and intermediate grade will meet on Mondays to review data and devise a plan for collaborative planning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The data showed that there was a need to focus on core instruction. Text selected should support the target and task by providing time for teachers to read and think through it. Teachers need to consider the challenges the text may bring certain students in terms of language, content and overall readability. This advanced reading and thinking of the text in planning will allow teachers to anticipate these challenges in terms of individual students. Teachers will be able to plan for individual scaffolding which would include the specific instructional delivery model, areas for modeling and explicit instruction, questions to guide student thinking and opportunities for where student collaboration will benefit understanding.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Establish a common time for each grade to plan lessons with one of the coaches. Invited and included in the common planning could be ELL, ESE, Migrant, ELA, coaches and administrators. This common planning time would occur at a set time weekly and focus on lesson development, which is a separate time than PLCs. However, the teachers would be provided data in the PLC to support their core instruction planning. This data will include iReady, PMA, screener and in-class formative assessments.

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

Walk through classrooms to see evidence of planning in action. Provide teachers feedback based on key elements of the lesson plan. Based on observations, provide embedded coaching to support key strategies of modeling, explicit instruction, scaffolding. This coaching could also include a fishbowl lesson with look-for's presented in advance with teachers. Lesson Study could also be used to help strengthen teachers craft, build community and allow for lesson revision. In both instances, feedback from teachers and coaches will be used to build the coaching cycle.

**Person Responsible** Ismael Lebron-Bravo (ismael.lebron-bravo@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.

**When reviewing the Safe Schools for Alex data, Wimauma reported 0.17 incidents per 100 students. Compared to 1,395 elementary school state wide that ranked us #250 which placed our school in the Very Low category. In Hillsborough County, it ranked us #14 out of 119 elementary schools in the district. On the 2019-2020 numbers of reported suspensions, Wimauma Elementary was ranked number #1 both in the state and the county.**

**Administration and the Social Services Team will meet every other week to review data from the Behavior Tracker and Discipline. During these meetings, if teachers need support we will check in with them as needed. School-Wide we practice CHAMPS. The RTI Facilitator will conduct Tier 1 walk-throughs with administration to see what is needed for school-wide discipline.**

**Administrations and other certified teachers will assist to monitor students in the cafeteria.**

**Assistance from the RTI Facilitator and administration will establish behavior expectations that can be used throughout the school.**

### 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.

Administration will meet with the Student Services Team every other Tuesday of the month to review data on discipline and attendance of students. RTI Facilitator with administration will conduct a classroom walkthrough to collect a baseline with a focus on eight look-fors. There will be a mid-year and an end-of-the-year walkthrough to see if there have been any progress. The information will be shared with the SST and assist to create plans as needed. Based off the data, as a school we will create expectations for appropriate behavior.

As a school, CHAMPS is used in classrooms, hallways, media center, and in the cafeteria. Extra support will be placed in the cafeteria to monitor student behavior and build relationships with the student. There will be a visible presence by administration, school counselor, school social worker, and another certified teacher on a rotating basis.

In fifth grade, the teachers will have the students broken up in a House Behavior System based off Florida Colleges. Students from each homeroom will have placed in their "College House" (FSU, USF, UCF, and UF).

They will hold weekly meetings to total the amount of points a college has and declare a weekly champion. The ultimate goal is to decide at the end of the year which college is the winner.

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

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

## **Part V: Budget**

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

|               |               |   |               |
|---------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| <b>1</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <b>2</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>                    | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |