

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Patricia Sullivan Metropolitan Ministries Partnership



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Patricia Sullivan Metropolitan Ministries Partnership School

102 E PALM AVE, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dave Mcmeen

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (73%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Patricia Sullivan Metropolitan Ministries Partnership School

102 E PALM AVE, Tampa, FL 33602

[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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

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

To provide an education and the supports that enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

District Mission: To provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time.

Preparing Students for Life

District Vision: 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
Mc Meen, Dave	Principal	Coordinates educational programs for all students, observe teachers and provide feedback, conduct evaluations on all staff, develop master schedules, monitor and conduct safety drills, oversee financial budgets including payroll, oversee maintenance needs, organize yearly calendars including meet the teacher, open house, parent conferences, parent/staff trainings, monitor behavior, social/emotional well-being, oversee student nutrition, oversee mentors and volunteers, educational field trips, interview for all vacancies including hiring of staff, oversee cum records, conduct faculty, staff meetings and leadership meetings, communicate with students, parents, staff and community at large to keep all stakeholders informed, implement/oversee intervention strategies with staff and students, monitor enrollment with relation to class size amendment and other duties as directed by the superintendent.
Brown, Kathy	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and instruction, attendance, behavior, professional development, textbooks and materials, acting principal when principal is not on campus.
DeHart, Carolyn	School Counselor	School counselor, character education, social and emotional support
Russo, Angela	Curriculum Resource Teacher	ELA and writing resource teacher for grades 3-5

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Dave Mcmeen

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Total number of students enrolled at the school

78

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

1

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

1

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	13	14	8	17	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Attendance below 90 percent	2	6	2	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 8/12/2022

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	17	10	17	15	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	2	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	17	10	17	15	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	2	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	53%	56%				53%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	82%						52%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								50%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	50%	50%				49%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	88%						62%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								46%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	59%	59%				57%	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	60%	52%	8%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

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	63%	54%	9%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	57%	-24%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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
BLK	56	70		41							
FRL	69	82		64	88		60				
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
BLK	39			39							
FRL	58			60	70		50				
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	20			40							
BLK	38			38							
HSP	62	36		50	40						
FRL	53	52		49	62		57				

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	73
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	56
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	73
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 following data reflects information from the 2022 Florida State Assessment in grades 3-5.
 Grade 3-5 English Language Arts level 3 and above 69%
 Grade 3-5 English Language Arts learning gains 82%
 Grade 3-5 Math level 3 and above 64%
 Grade 3-5 Math learning gains 88%
 Grade 5 Science level 3 and above 60%
 Total = 73% which equated to a school grade of "A"
 School Grade data by year is listed below:
 2022 - A (73%)
 2021 - B (60%)
 2020 - No testing due to pandemic
 2019 - B (55%)
 2018 - C
 2017 - F
 2016 - C

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

After further review of the 2022 Florida State Assessment data for grades 3-5, fifth grade Science assessment was the lowest percentage score for any category (60%). Math proficiency (64%) was the second lowest percentage score for all categories as measured by the Florida Department of Education, School Accountability.

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

Students enrolled at Sullivan Partnership School fluctuate from month to month and/or year to year, so it is hard to determine the overall area for need of improvement because the educational needs for each child changes based on new students being enrolled each school year. While it is important to review and reflect on the data, careful consideration should be taken as to not only look at one set of data

points based on the percentage score. Fifth grade Science percentage score was based only on how well students did in this category and only ten students enrolled at the time. With six out of ten students showing proficiency, sixty percent would be the calculated score used for school accountability.

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

Grade 3-5 Math learning gains.

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

Response to Intervention groups were established early on in the school year and specific targeted lessons were delivered throughout the school year. Teachers delivered instruction that correlated directly to the their current level and students responded well to these areas of deficiency.

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

We have been looking at each individual student and their needs and we will continue to focus on each child and provide the supports as needed throughout the school year. This practice has built up student confidence and the past three years of student data has shown this.

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.

With the start of the 2022-2023 school year, the new standards and curriculum is being used for the first time. Online professional development and in person district training has been provided and will continue to be provided throughout the school year.

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

Giving teachers the time to plan is important as they learn a new curriculum and new state standards. The English Language Arts teacher will continue to plan with grade 3-5 teachers and provide support in/out of the classroom. Tutorial services for students will be provided again that will be matched to student needs.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Six out of eight grade 3-5 Black/African American students scored a level one on their Florida State Assessment English Language Arts test.

Five out of seven grade 3-5 Black/African American students scored a level one on their Florida State Assessment Math test.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

A twenty percent decrease in the number of grade 3-5 Black/African American students scoring a level 1 on the FAST test in both English Language Arts and Math when administered in April 2023.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

All students in grades 3-5 will be progress monitored and an additional focus will be given to monitor Black/African American students in grades 3-5. Students will also be engaged with I-Ready lessons throughout the year and the students path can be changed to match the area of support needed. Teacher made unit assessments will also be used to monitor student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dave Mc Meen (dave.mcmeen@hcps.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The MTSS process will be followed that will identify the students into three categories; red, yellow and green. After each type of assessment a data analysis of how students performed will be recorded, analyzed and a plan for reteaching and support provided.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Over the past three years, Sullivan Partnership School has shown steady progress and academic gains has been recognized each year. By following the MTSS process, student assessment data analysis guides the teachers, resource teacher and administration to ensuring wrap around support is provided to help students be successful.

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.

Teachers will reach out to parents to build a relationship with the student and family.

Parent/Teacher conferences will be offered at least three times a year.

Tutorial support will be offered to a select group of students needing additional time to show academic growth.

Mentors will be offered to a select group of students during the 2022-2023 school year that will help build student confidence with their academics and behavior.

Person Responsible Kathy Brown (kathy.brown@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.

Sullivan Partnership School is the smallest school in the school district and is associated with Metropolitan Ministries which is located directly across the street from the school. Primary student enrollment come from the families residing on the Metropolitan Ministries campus in their housing program and the additional families enrolled are done so through the School Choice program. Students enrolled at the school and coming from the shelter stay an undetermined number of days, months or possibly years. Most students housed at the shelter finish their program and move into more stable housing but opt to stay at the school for the remainder of the school year. Building a strong culture involves building a system of expectations and supports. Students are set up for success from the very first day of school. The small campus allows the adult professionals to have a more relational type of support with many adult professionals communicating with the child and family.

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

Dave McMeen, principal
 Kathy Brown, assistant principal
 Melisa Hill, kindergarten
 Lisa Monette, first grade
 Kelsey Spaulding, second grade
 Mandy Hambrick, third grade
 Kellie Taylor, fourth grade
 Patti Ferlita, fifth grade
 Diana Napier, varying exceptionality
 Angela Russo, reading resource
 Jodi Vizzi, media specialist
 Christina Bartley, psychologist
 Jody Orlando, social worker
 Alisa Ferlita, kindergarten assistant
 Robyn Mellin, Metropolitan Ministries supervisor
 Anthony Ahmar, secretary 1
 Daisy Quiles, data processor
 Kim McCutcheon, secretary 4
 Carol Bolton, school nurse
 Carolyn DeHart, guidance counselor