

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Apollo Beach Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Apollo Beach Elementary School

501 APOLLO BEACH BLVD, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Mcmillan

Start Date for this Principal: 4/22/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (66%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Apollo Beach Elementary School

501 APOLLO BEACH BLVD, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	42%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

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.

Achieve Goals
Build connections
Engage Hearts and Minds
Support growth

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Students for Life

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McMillan, Kelly	Principal	Oversee development and maintenance of the SIP plan, collaborate with stakeholders, attend meetings.
Kiser, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Oversee development and maintenance of the SIP plan, collaborate with stakeholders, attend meetings.
Banks, Christine	Teacher, K-12	Oversee development and maintenance of the SIP plan, collaborate with stakeholders, attend meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 4/22/2015, Kelly Mcmillan

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

555

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

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	89	94	98	105	86	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	554
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	13	24	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	0	2	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	93	101	114	109	98	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	619
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	8	10	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	14	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	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	4	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	93	101	114	109	98	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	619
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	8	10	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	14	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	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	4	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	53%	56%				69%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						52%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						44%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	77%	50%	50%				74%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	78%						68%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						51%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	59%	59%				65%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	55%	13%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	74%	54%	20%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	57%	23%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	65%	51%	14%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	24	60	53	50	80	73	50				
ELL	44	73	67	54	76	69	18				
BLK	53	64		76	82						
HSP	51	63	53	58	68	55	43				
MUL	68	69		82	92		70				
WHT	65	60	47	84	80	67	68				
FRL	44	65	59	63	73	60	54				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	33	67		44	67	64	35				
ELL	46	45		54	91		55				
BLK	55			50							
HSP	46	52	40	61	87	82	48				
MUL	67			87							
WHT	75	62	60	81	86		75				
FRL	47	53	50	56	79	68	47				
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	33	26	31	43	61	56	25				
ELL	38	42		52	58						
BLK	57			62							
HSP	52	44	45	61	66	55	31				
MUL	93			73							
WHT	74	54	44	80	67	43	78				
FRL	54	45	46	55	61	37	27				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	499
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	69
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	76
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The progress of our BQ students continues to increase in ELA and remains high in mathematics. This is the first year our grade 4 students did not drop approximately 10 percentage points which we have attributed to writing. ELA continues to be our lower area, while students consistently perform better in mathematics.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Reading proficiency and gains

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

Lack of consistent curriculum and instruction. Changing materials and instructional guides requires time to adjust and navigate. Our inability to provide better differentiated support is a factor .

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

BQ gains continue to show improvement. Our SWD are no longer below the benchmark.

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

Our students in grade 4 have received three years of quality writing instruction through Units of Study which was an initiative we implemented when they were in 2nd grade. We knew this would take time

before seeing the impact. Also, small group instruction and utilizing math monthlies to address gaps while continuing to teach grade level content were factors contributing to improvement.

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

Differentiated instruction with targeted learning goals driven by frequent progress monitoring

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.

PD focused on differentiated instruction

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

Through ongoing progress monitoring and collaboration through PLCs and MTSS, we will problem solve and adjust interventions for students in order to accelerate learning and close achievement gaps. Other services can include additional support through small group, ELP in the morning, or lunch bunch groups to provide additional interventions.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ELA proficiency as measured by FSA continues to lag behind comparable schools by 5 or more percentage points. Furthermore, scores between third and fourth grade continue to show a decrease of 8 or more percentage points
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students in grades K-5 will increase their performance in reading by 3 percentage points as measured by the spring FAST or STAR Progress Monitoring Assessment through regular and effective small group instruction with a clearly communicated focus that accelerates or deepens learning of core content.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This will be monitored through progress monitoring assessments, walk throughs and observations, and PLC notes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly McMillan (kelly.mcmillan@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Visible learning effect sizes for the following strategies: -Small group +.47 -Acceleration +.68 -Clear goal intentions +.48
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Our teachers are effective at delivering core content, but struggle to provide scaffolding and acceleration for students who have not mastered standards. Based on reading and summer PD, acceleration through focused small group instruction is a way to impact student learning.
Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.	
-PD through book studies focused on supporting all learners. -PLCs three times a month to include long/short term planning and data analysis/reflection, PLC facilitators will ensure that teams are monitoring student progress through the analysis and reflection of data. Teams will specifically monitor progress of students in BQ and plan for intervention support. group and effectiveness of interventions provided in small groups	
Person Responsible	Kelly McMillan (kelly.mcmillan@hcps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

In order to ensure the social and emotional well-being of our students, we will continue to focus on character development and social emotional learning. Using our National School of Character feedback, our staff will focus on adjusting practices to better support the social-emotional needs of students. Principle #7 of the 11 Principles of Character is Student Motivation. This is the one area of focus provided to us by the National School of Character evaluation. The feedback focused on moving toward developing students intrinsic motivation versus providing incentives for behavior and character. Additionally, we were chosen as one of the ten pilot schools for 7 Mindsets. This will enhance our work with students. This year we will focus on the following in regard to Principle #7:

1. Continue year 2 implementation of 7 Mindsets curriculum (including PD during preplanning)
2. Continue our ABES Family meetings every month
3. Implement ABES Ambassadors and Greeters program which will focus on student leadership
4. Staff participation in PD about self awareness and bias.
5. Staff participation in PD with 7 Mindsets
6. Class meeting time built into daily schedule.
7. Continue making adjustments with classroom behavior plans that move away from incentive-based motivators.
7. Use the ABES matrix chart in common areas and engage students in creating one around classroom expectations in each class. This will align behavior expectations with character core values

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

All staff, parents, community partners all play a role in supporting and promoting a positive school culture and environment.