

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Tampa Palms 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 |

Tampa Palms Elementary School

6100 TAMPA PALMS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angela Gluth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 49% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (68%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (62%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | 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 |

Tampa Palms Elementary School

6100 TAMPA PALMS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">49%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">75%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Gluth, Angela | Principal | |
| May, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | |
| Small, Elyse | Other | |
| Smith, Lance | Other | |
| Sciandra, Cindy | Other | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/3/2022, Angela Gluth

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.*

3

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

761

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

11

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

11

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 | 116 | 123 | 114 | 131 | 104 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 701 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 30 | 37 | 24 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 66% | 53% | 56% | | | | 76% | 52% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 64% | | | | | | 72% | 55% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 54% | | | | | | 48% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 73% | 50% | 50% | | | | 76% | 54% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 79% | | | | | | 71% | 57% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 71% | | | | | | 47% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 66% | 59% | 59% | | | | 71% | 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 | 73% | 52% | 21% | 58% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 55% | 15% | 58% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 71% | 54% | 17% | 56% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -70% | | | | |

| 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 | 78% | 54% | 24% | 62% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 57% | 15% | 64% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -78% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 54% | 16% | 60% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -72% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 51% | 17% | 53% | 15% |
| 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 | 33 | 39 | 42 | 45 | 58 | 73 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 59 | 54 | 40 | 75 | 72 | | 56 | | | | |
| ASN | 84 | 85 | | 91 | 89 | | 88 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 55 | 64 | 45 | 73 | 83 | 32 | | | | |
| HSP | 55 | 44 | 23 | 68 | 75 | 62 | 58 | | | | |
| MUL | 75 | 71 | | 74 | 75 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 83 | 74 | | 84 | 80 | | 78 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 56 | 58 | 57 | 73 | 73 | 39 | | | | |

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 27 | 25 | 33 | 35 | 31 | 33 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 75 | 88 | 80 | 80 | 83 | | 90 | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | 82 | | 91 | 79 | | 92 | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 43 | 27 | 38 | 52 | 46 | 42 | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | 69 | | 63 | 69 | | 66 | | | | |
| MUL | 68 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 61 | | 79 | 77 | | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 49 | 36 | 43 | 53 | 38 | 51 | | | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 37 | 57 | 44 | 46 | 58 | 58 | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 68 | 70 | 39 | 74 | 79 | 63 | 52 | | | | |
| ASN | 93 | 79 | | 95 | 92 | | 95 | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 53 | 45 | 46 | 53 | 48 | 43 | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 76 | 62 | 64 | 62 | 54 | 55 | | | | |
| MUL | 71 | 69 | | 71 | 62 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 72 | 25 | 82 | 70 | 46 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 66 | 47 | 60 | 61 | 48 | 55 | | | | |

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 | 69 |
| 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 | 81 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 554 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 85 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 74 |
| 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 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 | 80 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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?

Our lowest performance was in the bottom 25% with 54% making gains in ELA (despite being an increase from the previous year). Our ELA proficiency was 66%, which was a decrease from the previous year. There were increases in all three components for math.

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

ELA Achievement, gains, and bottom quartile gains.
5th grade science

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

ELA planning guides showed an imbalance of fiction and nonfiction text with a long focus on certain standards, and increased student absences and tardies contributed to gaps in learning. Learning gaps will be addressed through acceleration and other differentiation practices.

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

Math achievement, gains, and bottom quartile gains all showed improvement from the previous year.

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

The math improvement was attributed to a school-wide professional development focus on math, coaching cycles for math teachers with district resource staff, and the use of data to drive instruction as teachers planned for lessons.

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

Weekly collaborative planning sessions that incorporate the review of student data to drive instructional decisions. Teachers will plan for differentiation and will ensure that learning tasks are aligned with the content standards.

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 for ELA teachers is planned to focus on foundational skills and targeted intervention strategies that align with each child's deficiency. Professional development will also focus on planning for small group instruction, utilizing data to plan for small group instruction, and understanding the BEST standards to plan for instruction and facilitate learning using the BEST standards.

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

Grade level content and vertical content PLCs
collaborative planning
student goal setting
ongoing progress monitoring
systematic data review

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 Differentiation

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Students at Tampa Palms have a wide range of learning needs. In order to effectively engage in core instruction, differentiation and acceleration strategies will be a part of all lessons. The effective use of standards-based instruction along with differentiation strategies will close the achievement gap for students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see student growth in all grades as measured through the PM assessments. Our goal is for every student to make learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will receive monthly feedback focused on how differentiation or acceleration impacted student learning outcomes. Data findings from common assessments will be reviewed when meeting for weekly planning meetings. Plans will include acceleration and/or differentiation strategies as well as common assessments for ongoing progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Gluth (angela.gluth@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Differentiation and acceleration strategies and supports

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Common assessments will be used to assess student needs and identify unfinished learning. Lessons will be differentiated to reinforce and enrich learning, prepare students for upcoming learning, and remediate as needed.

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.

Weekly common planning for reading and math at each grade level

Person Responsible Jennifer May (jennifer.may@hcps.net)

Common assessments used to progress monitor student learning across the grade level

Person Responsible Jennifer May (jennifer.may@hcps.net)

Actionable feedback to teachers each month

Person Responsible Angela Gluth (angela.gluth@hcps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students will receive intensive small group instruction that is targeted to specific needs based on data obtained from iReady, common Wonders unit assessments, and the progress monitoring assessments given at the beginning and middle of the school year.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students will receive intensive small group instruction that is targeted to specific needs based on data obtained from iReady, common Wonders unit assessments, and the progress monitoring assessments given at the beginning and middle of the school year.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 2, who score at a proficient level, by 3-4 percentage points from the beginning of the year assessment to the end of the year assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring at a proficient level on the statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Student progress will be monitored through the use of common assessments, utilizing iReady, Wonders unit assessments, and PM assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

May, Jennifer, jennifer.may@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teachers will use a multi-tiered system of support to monitor student progress through core instruction and intensive interventions that target student deficits in English Language Arts. Teachers will align intensive instruction after analyzing student progress monitoring results along with data from core instruction in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Utilizing a multi-tiered system of support allows for students to receive targeted instruction that is closely monitored for fidelity with regards to intervention alignment and participation allows teachers to provide intensive support to students in their specific area of need.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---|
| <p>Assessment: Students will be routinely assessed through iReady diagnostics and progress monitoring assessments, Wonders unit assessments, and progress monitoring assessments. Data from these assessments will be analyzed to develop data-informed lessons that target student literacy deficiencies. The effectiveness of the interventions will be monitored at six week intervals, with adjustments to interventions made as needed.</p> | <p>May, Jennifer, jennifer.may@hcps.net</p> |
| <p>Professional Learning: Teachers will be provided with professional development as needed to provide support with core instruction when implementing the BEST standards. Teachers will also receive support from the student services team when utilizing the multi-tiered system of support to help eliminate barriers that may impede student learning gains.</p> | <p>Gluth, Angela, angela.gluth@hcps.net</p> |

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.

The school will address building a positive school culture and environment through the incorporation of student-led programs/activities that allow students to take an active role in the school. These include but are not limited to focused clubs after school, leadership positions, student council, the National Elementary Junior Honor Society, service learning, and evening events that allow families to form relationships outside of the classroom.

Students will have incentives and rewards through the use of Eagle Bucks to support the tier 1 school-wide behavior system, academic awards, and recognition for character education traits exhibited in the classroom.

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

Administration oversees the implementation of all of the programs at Tampa Palms Elementary. The action team committees develop various leadership opportunities for students, and teachers and staff support the clubs, recognition programs and leadership roles for students. The PTA and SAC work closely with the school to reinforce having a positive school culture.