

Hillsborough County Public Schools

West Tampa Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

West Tampa Elementary School

2700 W CHERRY ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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.

Preparing students for life.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kastner, Kevin	Principal	Instructional leader
Fuentes, Jessica	SAC Member	SAC Chair
	Magnet Coordinator	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Ms. Fuentes and Mr. Kastner will write the original draft which will be reviewed and edited by the teachers and PTA. All stakeholders will have an opportunity to ask questions and suggest edits.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will drive the instructional priorities and school focus for the year. We will revisit and edit as needed.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	26	13	14	12	8	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	20	11	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	18	8	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	12	25	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	9	20	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	13	15	15	7	20	0	0	0	88
	0	0	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	11

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	17	11	18	9	8	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	14	6	14	25	0	0	0	60

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	5	5	8	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	17	11	18	9	8	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	14	6	14	25	0	0	0	60

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	5	5	8	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	50	53	46	53	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				46			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41					
Math Achievement*	62	56	59	63	50	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				64			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50					

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	27	50	54	40	59	59	9		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	72	59	59	57			42		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	257
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	2	1
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	2	
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			62			27					72
SWD	27			38			0				5	61
ELL	44			59			10				5	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			60							3	
HSP	49			61			23				5	70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	48			61			28				5	72

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	46	41	63	64	50	40					57
SWD	21	29		39	39	40	19					31
ELL	41	40	35	63	68	71	35					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	38		47	29		14					
HSP	47	48	35	64	72	73	48					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	47	49	43	61	63	52	39					57

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	33		50	33		9					42
SWD	8	21		31	36		8					23
ELL	37	30		44	30							42

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	20		44	27		0					
HSP	42	40		52	37		12					40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	37	33		47	33		9					42

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	54%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	54%	6%	58%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	46%	-12%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	55%	-13%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	21%	47%	-26%	51%	-30%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA proficiency was the lowest. Large overcrowded classrooms in 5th grade and larger than average third grade classrooms led to decreased student to teacher ratio. The change of benchmarks and testing also created increased planning load, professional development, and implementation.

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

Math declined the most. The factor that most contributed was a change in benchmarks and online state test. The curriculum was very different from what teachers were used to and a delay in teacher resources and materials didn't allow teachers to start off strong. Teachers required time to learn new benchmarks.

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.

5th grade reading and math had the most gaps with a difference of 14 and 11 points respectively. The factor that most contributed was large class sizes and the effect of COVID affected this grade level the most, putting them the farthest behind of our grade levels.

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

4th grade math and reading showed the most improvement. We were able to keep a small student to teacher ratio in 3rd and 4th grade for this cohort. We pushed in support from teacher leaders to assist with small group instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Phonics and vocabulary are some of the biggest concerns. Course material did not support these areas as well as a lack of high quality phonics curriculum. We are changing to the science of reading and UFLI curriculum in primary and for use in interventions to support these areas of need. We also purchased Flocabulary to help students improve their lexicon.

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

Collaborative Planning
CBS meeting daily

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Collective efficacy according to Hattie has the greatest effect size for impact on student achievement, so we believe we need to create a sacred time for teachers to meet with the coach to plan implementation and delivery of curriculum.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to see an increase in proficiency levels by 10% in math and ELA on each progress monitoring assessment. For example, if 10% of our students were proficient on PM1, we are aiming for 20% proficiency on PM2.

Monitoring:

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

We will use Wonders Unit assessments in ELA and Quarterly monitoring assessments in Math to monitor growth and progress towards proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Collaborative Planning, backwards planning of units, and data analysis

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Backwards planning, collaborative planning, and data analysis will increase our collective rates of teacher efficacy and student performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide mini professional development around formative assessment.

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: On-going

Provide mini professional development around formative assessment.

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: On-going

Provide mini professional development around formative assessment.

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: On-going

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Implement Frameworks curriculum, create structured time and supports for data analysis and implementation of the continuous improvement model and the four step problem solving process.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in K-5 will increase scores on DESSA survey from survey 1 to survey 3.

Monitoring:

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

Monitor using DESSA survey attendance rates and behavioral data by behavioral referrals decreasing. We are expecting to see increased attendance rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implementation of common planning and CBS meetings schoolwide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In conjunction with district personnel we decided to partner with Frameworks to implement their curriculum schoolwide. PLCs are globally known as best practice.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Schedule common planning and CBS schedule

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: 08/10

Schedule Professional Development

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: As needed

Calendar assessment and data dives

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: Fall

Frameworks and PTA will implement parent event(s)

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: Fall

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Collaborative planning will be focused on using formative assessment to close academic gaps, teachers and interventionist will collaborate around systematic small group interventions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students should increase at least one bucket from PM1 to PM3 to show a learning gain.

Monitoring:

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

If the need is phonics, teachers will use Diebels to monitor student growth in the high-need areas identified in the student's IEP. If the need is comprehension, teachers will use iReady curriculum to provide interventions and monitor using the assessments in iReady. Exit tickets and quarterly monitoring assessments will be used to monitor growth in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

UFLI, Diebels, iReady as well as collaborative planning and small group intervention are evidence based interventions to track and close achievement gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With high quality new curriculum and collaboration around student progress, students will receive supports necessary to close gaps.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Schedule Assessments

Schedule data analysis with support of admin and coaches

Identify high need areas and plan reteach lessons

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: Fall

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Literacy leadership-leadership will collaborate with coaches and attend PLCs. Leadership will also provide data to drive the PLC.

Literacy Coaching-Coaches will analyze data to assist teacher with planning, and coaches will model effective strategies for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will increase at least one bucket as measured from PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:

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

During collaborative planning meetings, coaches will work with teachers to assist them with data analysis and identification of high need students and resources. They will also support planning and effective strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

UFLI, Diebels, iReady, PLCs, Collaborative Planning, Data Analysis

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

UFLI is a research-based program being implemented this year to increase student abilities in phonics. It is supported by the science of reading and will be used as whole group instruction and as needed for intervention. Diebels will be used to assess this progress to make sure the interventions are working. PLCs, collaborative planning, and data analysis help build teacher efficacy which has an effect size of 1.57 on Hattie's scale of effective practice.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Schedule Assessments

Schedule data analysis with support of admin and coaches

Identify high need areas and plan reteach lessons

Person Responsible: Kevin Kastner (kevin.kastner@hcps.net)

By When: Fall

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Team met on multiple occasions to determine how the funding would be spent using the CNA template. Funds will be allocated as such:

Math and Reading Resource Teachers
Academic Interventionist
Magnetic Reading

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Implementation of data analysis meetings to target student deficiencies reading according to the state test

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

Implementation of data analysis meetings to target student deficiencies reading according to the state test

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

During the 2023-2024 school year reading proficiency in grade 2 will increase to an average of 50% or higher on the state assessment in May.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

During the 2023-2024 school year reading proficiency in grades 3 and 4 will increase to an average of 50% or higher on the state assessment in May,

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitor Diebels assessment data throughout the 2023-2024 school year to ensure students will have the phonetic capacity to decode a text in grade 2 and in grades 3-5 we will monitor the data collected from the Wonders Unit assessments given on 6-week cycles to improve reading comprehension skills and ensure mastery of grade level benchmarks and standards.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Kastner, Kevin, kevin.kastner@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

UFLI, Flamingo, Diebles and Wonders Unit Assessments aligned to BEST ELA standards. Implementation of data analysis meetings to target deficiencies in ELA. Collaboration builds teacher efficacy which has the highest impact on Hattie's scale related to high student achievement.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The need of all students will be met through the data analysis meetings and collaboration needed to create implementation plans for teachers to use while creating both unit plans (scope and sequence) and daily lessons.

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
Calendar data analysis meetings with support from our Reading Resource teachers. Hold data analysis meetings with resource support Monitor the implementation of the plan with classroom observations.	Kastner, Kevin, kevin.kastner@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We are going to send a link to all stakeholders and print a copy upon request. A copy will also be stored in the front office for reference.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Partnership with PTA

Partnership with Frameworks of Tampa Bay to support social skills and emotional development

Parent links, SAC meetings, Parent Conferences, Parent events, and newsletters will involve families and communities in the school.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

School will implement collaborative planning, use of coaches to increase quality of instruction, ELP funds will focus on filling in academic gaps, and we have allocated funds towards curriculum and resource teachers.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A