

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Muller Elementary Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Muller Elementary Magnet School

13615 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33613

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melanie Bottini

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2020

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Muller Elementary Magnet School, staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement

Muller Elementary Magnet School will prepare students for life through the arts, sciences, and leadership.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bottini, Melanie	Principal	1. Instructional leadership 2. Building management 3. Culture building 4. Safety and security of all stakeholders

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/17/2020, Melanie Bottini

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.*

3

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	70	73	70	72	71	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	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	1	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/17/2020

Prior Year - 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	73	74	69	75	65	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - 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	73	74	69	75	65	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	64%	52%	57%	54%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	55%	58%	50%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	50%	53%	31%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	61%	54%	63%	57%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	74%	57%	62%	60%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	46%	51%	37%	44%	47%
Science Achievement	61%	50%	53%	70%	51%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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	2019	68%	52%	16%	58%	10%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	57%	12%	64%	5%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	51%	10%	53%	8%
	2018	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	47	55		42	68	55					
ELL	35	52	58	55	73	54	47				
BLK	67	59	69	51	68	53	40				
HSP	53	61	62	63	73	57	67				
WHT	80	80		72	87						
FRL	59	63	65	57	71	57	57				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	48	33	28	52	42	27				
ELL	21	40		31	44						
BLK	52	40	21	48	47	28	70				
HSP	49	56	40	57	64		63				
WHT	67	53		75	87						
FRL	52	48	27	54	56	31	70				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	63
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	58
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	62
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	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	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

The two lowest performing areas were 3rd Grade Math and 5th Grade Math, both with 57% proficiency. This is not a trend for either grade level. 3rd grade math jumped 11% from last year and the 5th grade same cohort jumped 2%. We attribute this lower proficiency to a larger focus on reading and pulling reading small groups more often than math small groups.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

The greatest decline happened in 5th grade science which went from 70% proficiency last year to 61% this year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

The greatest gap occurred in 3rd Grade Math, which was 5% lower than the state and 5th Grade Math which was 3% lower than the state. This has been the case for 2 years in 3rd grade, but it is not a trend for 5th grade. Factors that contributed are having a stronger focus on Reading than Math but also not having a teacher who was best suited for teaching 3rd grade math in that spot, which has since been changed.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Most improved was 3rd grade ELA which was a 20% jump and Bottom Quartile ELA and Math Gains. For ELA it was a 33% gain and from Math an 18% gain. Our focus last year was on gains so we pulled more rigorous small groups, more planned out MTSS, had BQ Buddy Readers, and focused our ELP Tutor on pulling those kids

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. Attendance in the younger grades. Plan to address this is the Social Worker will create a school wide attendance goal with incentives for classes that meet the goal.
2. Number of Level 1s in 4th and 5th grade. Plan to address this is to have members of our instructional personnel be a Buddy Reader for our Bottom Quartile students.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Focus on maintaining proficiency
2. Accelerating all learners
3. Standards Alignment
4. Create a culture of high expectations for learning
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Standards-aligned instruction was selected as an area of focus due to formative data collected through walkthroughs that revealed there was a misalignment between the standard, the focus of learning, and the product. This impacts student learning because without begin aligned, students are not able to independently apply their new learning.

Measureable Outcome: Support teachers' planning with understanding the standard and developing lessons and providing appropriate feedback to students to push their learning. This will be as evidence by iReady placement data.
 In the 18-19 school year, 73% of students were on grade level and in the 19-20 school year, 61% of students were on grade level in Reading on iReady diagnostics. Our 20-21 goal is for 75% of students to be on grade level in Reading on iReady diagnostics.
 In the 18-19 school year, 67% of students were on grade level and in the 19-20 school year, 44% of students were on grade level in Math on iReady diagnostics. Our 20-21 goal is for 70% of students to be on grade level in Math on iReady diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Weekly common planning with coaches
2. On-going coaching cycles and feedback by administration and coaches
3. On-going progress monitoring and data analysis sessions
4. On-going professional development in standards based alignment

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- 1.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Coaches and resource teachers will facilitate weekly standards based planning sessions

- support development of instructional plans
- evaluate student work and data
- deepen teachers' understanding of resources and best practices

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

2. Coaches, resource teachers and administrators will provide formative feedback instructional and student performance

- instructional learning walks
- formative classroom observations
- coaching cycles
- planning session support and protocol development

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

3. Students' data will be used in planning sessions and in separate data analysis sessions

- administer monthly assessments for students in math and reading

- create action plans that address student data
- adjust instructional plans regularly
- leverage resources and staff to support student needs

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

4. Professional development will be offered throughout the year in a variety of ways
- job embedded PD: lesson students, learning walks, coaching cycles, modeling
 - conferences and training
 - monthly PLCs
 - curriculum training

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Differentiation with acceleration was selected as an area of focus because though we made significant gains with our bottom quartile, data showed that some of our core and high performing students plateaued and need to be accelerated.

Measurable Outcome: In the 18-19 school year, 31% of students made learning gains and in the 19-20 school year, 63% of students made learning gains in Reading on the FSA Assessment. Our 20-21 goal is for 70% of students to make learning gains on Reading FSA
 In the 18-19 school year, 60% of students made learning gains and in the 19-20 school year, 74% of students made learning gains in Math on the FSA Assessment. Our 20-21 goal is for 75% of students to make learning gains on Math FSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Weekly common planning with coaches
2. On-going coaching cycles and feedback by administration and coaches
3. On-going progress monitoring and data analysis sessions
4. On-going professional development in differentiation

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

1. Coaches and resource teachers will facilitate weekly standards based planning sessions

- support development of instructional plans
- evaluate student work and data
- deepen teachers' understanding of resources and best practices
- deepen teachers' understanding on concepts and content

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

2. Coaches, resource teachers and administrators will provide formative feedback instructional and student performance

- instructional learning walks
- formative classroom observations
- coaching cycles
- planning session support and protocol development

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

3. Students' data will be used in planning sessions and in separate data analysis sessions

- administer monthly assessments for students in math and reading
- create action plans that address student data
- adjust instructional plans regularly
- leverage resources and staff to support student needs

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

4. Professional development will be offered throughout the year in a variety of ways
- job embedded PD: lesson students, learning walks, coaching cycles, modeling
 - conferences and training
 - monthly PLCs
 - curriculum training

Person Responsible Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Muller is a Leader in Me School which focuses on the key concepts of Leadership, Academics, and Culture. Professional development starts with teachers learning and living the 7 Habits in order to strengthen our professional culture. Students are explicitly taught the 7 Habits which incorporates knowing themselves, positive peer interactions, problem solving, and goal setting.

All stakeholders participate in a yearly Leader in Me survey to progress monitor the effectiveness of the three key components of the Leader in Me Program. This data is used to continuously drive our culture building skills. This data is then used to plan on-going professional development for all stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3181 - Muller Elementary Magnet School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Math Coach would work with stakeholders to analyze data in order to plan and monitor Math instruction, plan with math teachers, model and teach differentiated student math groups, complete coaching cycles with teachers, and co-teach math lessons. In addition, continuous monitoring of Math data will be reviewed Weekly, presented to teachers and administration and strategies and plans will be adjusted according to need</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3181 - Muller Elementary Magnet School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach would work with stakeholders to analyze data in order to plan instruction, plan with reading teachers, model and teach student differentiated reading groups, complete coaching cycles with teachers, and co-teach reading lessons. In addition, continuous monitoring of Reading data will be reviewed weekly, presented to teachers and administration, and strategies and plans will be adjusted to need.</i>			
					Total:	\$0.00