

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Gibson 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	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Gibsonton Elementary School

7723 GIBSONTON DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Bree Beitelschies

Start Date for this Principal: 4/10/2017

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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (38%) 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	21

Gibsonton Elementary School

7723 GIBSONTON DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

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.

To empower all Gibsonton Elementary stakeholders to be global life long learners through high quality academically individualized instruction while instilling core values.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Rise above challenges and strive for success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Guy, Cindy	Principal	Instructional Leader
Feaster, Emily	Parent Engagement Liaison	SAC Chair, Leads parent engagement activities and plans

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/10/2017, Bree Beitelschies

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

531

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	69	73	92	80	79	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	24	34	35	31	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	36	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	43	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	17	9	28	18	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	1	0	4	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	7	13	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 11/5/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	55	87	75	87	80	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465
Attendance below 90 percent	16	33	23	29	33	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	10	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	1	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	30	25	31	14	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
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	61	86	82	89	81	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	28	32	32	37	34	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	10	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	1	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	30	25	31	14	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
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				33%	52%	57%	35%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	55%	58%	39%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	50%	53%	39%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				45%	54%	63%	46%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	57%	62%	49%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	46%	51%	23%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				32%	50%	53%	36%	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	24%	52%	-28%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	64%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	51%	-18%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady reading and mathematics, District assessment for Science

Grade 1					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		9	7	17
	Economically Disadvantaged		9	7	17
	Students With Disabilities		0	1	2
	English Language Learners		1	1	2
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		5	4	16
	Economically Disadvantaged		5	4	16
	Students With Disabilities		1	0	1
	English Language Learners		2	1	3

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	15	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	15	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	3
	English Language Learners	1	2	4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	2	8
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	2	8
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	1	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	7	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	7	17
	Students With Disabilities	4	1	1
	English Language Learners	1	2	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	4	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	4	16
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	2
	English Language Learners	1	1	2

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	6	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	6	12
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	1
	English Language Learners	1	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	3	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	3	10
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	1
	English Language Learners	3	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	4	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	4	6
	Students With Disabilities	4	0	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	4	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	4	7
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	3
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	19	35	14
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	35	14
	Students With Disabilities	2	5	2
	English Language Learners	2	2	0
	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	16	22	18	25	33	25	8				
ELL	26	44		31	26		17				
BLK	43			50							
HSP	32	48	55	37	30	20	22				
WHT	30	48		41	39		29				
FRL	31	47	42	38	33	35	23				
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	16	46	59	37	56	43	15				
ELL	21	41	44	38	67	55	16				
BLK	20	27		13	18						
HSP	29	47	52	41	70	57	26				
WHT	45	63		62	68		47				
FRL	33	52	54	44	64	46	34				
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	8	28	39	18	30	28	13				
ELL	21	30	36	29	48	38	7				
BLK	30										
HSP	33	38	38	40	45	24	32				
WHT	35	34	33	54	57	25	40				
FRL	35	38	36	46	48	21	35				

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	37
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	297
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	32
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	47
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	36
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	
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	37
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	37
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?

Proficiency in 3rd grade propped by 11 percent in 2019 and dropped again in 2021. Proficiency for students in 3rd grade at the end of 2021 was 28.7%. Each year approximately 75% of students come into 3rd grade reading below level. We have been unable to increase the number of students reading on level in K-2. Students also have struggled with basic number sense in mathematics and this affects their ability to solve problems in the upper grades as they deal with larger numbers and more abstract problems.

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

Proficiency in 3rd grade propped by 11 percent in 2019 and dropped again in 2021. Proficiency for students in 3rd grade at the end of 2021 was 28.7%. Proficiency in reading and mathematics are at least 10 points below the district.

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

Too many students are below level in the primary grades in both reading and mathematics. This gap then continues in the intermediate grades. Poor attendance is a factor in that 40% of students attend school less than 90% of the time. We will focus on planning for core instruction that includes strategies for acceleration and closing the gaps with small group instruction bringing in all stakeholders to accomplish the growth needed.

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

Science has shown a big improvement with 42.67% of students showing proficient at the mid-year assessment.

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

This year, 5th grade worked with a district resource teacher every two weeks to plan for instruction. Data from formative assessment was used to drive instruction and fill gaps from previous learning. Next year, we will expand this planning to include 4th grade.

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

Reading, math and science coaches will plan for instruction with classroom teachers in every grade level k-5. Planning will include not only core instruction but also address gaps in prerequisite skills during small group rotations. Coaches and administration will also hold data chats after every formative assessment in order to drive changes in 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.

Professional development will center around the new standards and curriculum in K-2, student goal setting and conferencing, effective small group instruction, and standardized procedures at every grade level.

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

Two model classrooms in third grade will be developed so that teachers can continue "on the job" learning in real time with real students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 2021 FSA scores, 32% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on ELA FSA. 46% of students made learning gains and 45% of the bottom quartile made learning gains. Subgroups: ESSA subgroup ELL scored a proficiency percentage of 16% as opposed to 36% for non ELL students. SWD scored a proficiency percentage of 19% as opposed to 36% of non SWD students. Students have unfinished learning in all grade levels. Teachers must address these gaps through acceleration and differentiation during whole/small groups instruction and independent practice with aggressive monitoring and feedback to students. K-2 reading needs to be strengthened before students reach third grade.

Measurable Outcome: Student proficiency in reading will rise as a result of standards based planning to include accelerating core instruction, differentiation, and aggressive monitoring with feedback to students. All subgroups will rise to at least 41% of available points on FSA 21-22.

Monitoring: Learning will be measured by District assessments Fall, Winter and Spring. Results of these assessments will be disaggregated in data chats with coaches, administration, teachers and district leaders at least these three times. More frequent school formative assessments will be given in order to adjust instruction for student success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 1. Institute a systematic plan for standards based planning for core and small group instruction that includes acceleration and aggressive monitoring.
 2. Use data from formative assessments of student learning, along with focused, timely feedback to students in order to accelerate learning during whole/small group instruction and independent practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In 2021, 32 % of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on ELA FSA. Subgroups ELL was 16% and SWD 19%. Students have gaps unfinished learning in every grade level in ELA and teachers must address these gaps through acceleration and differentiation rather than through remediation. K-2 reading needs to be strengthened before students reach third grade.

Action Steps to Implement

1a. Reading coaches and teacher leaders will facilitate planning for grades K-5 for one hour at least once weekly. Planning sessions will focus on the standards to teach, small group instruction, assessment for learning, aggressive monitoring laps with data chats to discuss success as well as reteach to increase mastery of the standard.

1b. Coaches and instructional aides will pull small targeted groups for teaching unmastered prerequisite skills in grades k-5 at least three times a week. Teachers will pull small groups daily that are targeted toward acceleration.

1c. Coaches and teacher leaders will provide targeted professional development to strengthen the aggressive monitoring technique. One session per quarter with small group sessions as needed. Administrators will give feedback toward progress.

1d. After school enrichment opportunities will be utilized to increase student learning time.

1e Subgroups ___ will be included in all targeted groups when deemed non-proficient.

Person Responsible Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 2021 FSA scores, 39% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on Mathematics FSA. 34% of students made learning gains and 33% of the bottom quartile made learning gains. Subgroups: ESSA subgroup ELL scored a proficiency percentage of 23% as opposed to 42% for non ELL students. SWD scored a proficiency percentage of 22% as opposed to 44% of non SWD students. Students have unfinished learning in all grade levels. Teachers must address these gaps through acceleration and differentiation during whole/small groups instruction and independent practice with aggressive monitoring and feedback to students. K-2 mathematics needs to be strengthened before students reach third grade.

Measurable Outcome: Student proficiency in mathematics will rise as a result of standards based planning to include accelerating core instruction, differentiation, and aggressive monitoring with feedback to students. All subgroups will rise to at least 41% of available points on FSA 21-22.

Monitoring: Learning will be measured by District assessments Fall, Winter and Spring. Results of these assessments will be disaggregated in data chats with coaches, administration, teachers and district leaders at least these three times. More frequent school formative assessments will be given in order to adjust instruction for student success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 1. Institute a systematic plan for standards based planning for core and small group instruction that includes acceleration and aggressive monitoring.
2. Use data from formative assessments of student learning, along with focused, timely feedback to students in order to accelerate learning during whole/small group instruction and independent practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In 2021, 39 % of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on Mathematics FSA. Subgroups ELL was 23% and SWD 22%. Students have gaps unfinished learning in every grade level in mathematics and teachers must address these gaps through acceleration and differentiation rather than through remediation. K-2 mathematics needs to be strengthened before students reach third grade.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1a. Math coaches and teacher leaders will facilitate planning for grades K-5 for one hour at least once weekly. Planning sessions will focus on the standards to teach, small group instruction, assessment for learning, aggressive monitoring laps with data chats to discuss success as well as reteach to increase mastery of the standard.
- 1b. Coaches and instructional aides will pull small targeted groups for teaching unmastered prerequisite skills in grades k-5 at least three times a week. Teachers will pull small groups daily that are targeted toward acceleration.
- 1c. Coaches and teacher leaders will provide targeted professional development to strengthen the aggressive monitoring technique. One session per quarter with small group sessions as needed. Administrators will give feedback toward progress.
- 1d. After school enrichment opportunities will be utilized to increase student learning time.
- 1e Subgroups ___ will be included in all targeted groups when deemed non-proficient.

Person Responsible Cindy Guy (cindy.guy@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.

Gibsonton has a rate of 1.2 incidents per 100 students which is just about the 1.0 rate for the state. We will develop behavior intervention teams that will assist teachers with positive behavior plans at the beginning of a behavior that interrupts learning. School wide procedures will be implemented to provide consistency for all students. The behavior teams, which will include administration and special services personnel, will monitor data Tier 1, 2 and 3 behavior data in order to provide more intensive interventions when needed.

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.

Through our Community School initiative, Gibsonton Elementary conducts surveys to all stakeholders to find out the needs and barriers to success for all students. The Community Resource works with families and staff to meet the various needs that come up through the year. During the 2021-2022 school year, we will also use the data from the Panorama Survey of students to identify areas of SEL needs that can be worked on to strengthen the social/emotional learning for all students. Specifically we will:

1. Strategically share information using a variety of modalities regarding upcoming events and opportunities for families.
2. Hold monthly parent-led PTA meetings.
3. Create and administer parent surveys regarding engagement and opportunities on a quarterly basis.
4. Launch a problem solving team to address the areas of parent engagement, attendance, and SEL using Improvement Science methodology.

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

Administrations: Create the opportunity and encourage teacher leaders to create or lead the culture and parent involvement committees

Teachers and other school based staff: Create, lead or support the culture and parent involvement committees. Help obtain resources necessary for student/family success.

District staff: Support efforts on the committees and provide resources that are available

Parents/Families: Communicate openly with school staff to better understand the needs of the school and also how the school can assist with their needs.

Students: Partner with families and school staff to grow both academically and socially.

Community: Partner with the school and families in areas of need.

Part V: Budget

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

1 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA							\$166,728.86
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22		
6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1601 - Gibsonton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$92,410.19		
<i>Notes: Reading Coach</i>							
5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1601 - Gibsonton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$50,513.46		
<i>Notes: Teacher Leader, ELA</i>							
5100	150-Aides	1601 - Gibsonton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$23,805.21		
<i>Notes: Title 1 Aide</i>							
2 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math							\$130,740.91
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22		
5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1601 - Gibsonton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$83,198.77		
<i>Notes: Math Resource teacher</i>							
5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1601 - Gibsonton Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$47,542.14		
<i>Notes: Teacher Leader Mathematics</i>							
Total:						\$297,469.77	