Davis Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Davis Elementary School

10907 MEMORIAL HWY, Tampa, FL 33615

[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.

We will provide opportunities for students to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to ensure a standard of excellence in developing each student, academically, emotionally and socially.

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
Isajar, Jacquelyn	Principal	Ensure the goals and activities of this SIP are conveyed to parents, staff, and the community. Attend monthly SAC meetings and oversee LLT.
Wilsey, Adriana	Assistant Principal	Ensure the goals and activities of this SIP are conveyed to parents, staff, and the community. Attend monthly SAC meetings and oversee LLT.
Sternberg, Doreen	Reading Coach	Chair LLT, analyze and monitor school wide data, and plan with teachers while implementing B.E.S.T. standards.
DeHart, Carolyn	School Counselor	Oversee the MTSS process and guide teachers in choosing the correct MTSS implementation in their classroom.
Willis, Kirsten	Instructional Coach	Oversee the MTSS process and TIER 1 PBIS.
Heck, Pamela		Oversee the MTSS process.
Logie, Tara	Instructional Coach	Oversee the MTSS process.

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.

The Leadership team looked at data to determine SIP goals. The SIP goals were then presented to the faculty for approval and the SAC committee for approval.

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))

We will review our SIP goals in our monthly LLT to make sure we are making strides in achieving our goals. The team will monitor data throughout the year. At monthly SAC meetings we will look at the data and make sure we are on track to meeting our SIP goals.

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	92%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C

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	49	30	27	38	22	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	5	9	9	0	0	0	26
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	43	43	1	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	40	41	1	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	34	21	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	31	17	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	10	8	13	20	8	0	0	0	60

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	3	25	10	0	0	0	38

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	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	7
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	5	36	21	46	24	29	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	26	37	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	39	27	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	8	10	22	15	11	0	0	0	70

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	1	1	1	6	7	2	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	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	5	36	21	46	24	29	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	26	37	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	39	27	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	8	10	22	15	11	0	0	0	70

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	1	1	1	6	7	2	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	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*	39	50	53	43	53	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				58			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			28		
Math Achievement*	41	56	59	52	50	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				66			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			47		
Science Achievement*	47	50	54	43	59	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	68	59	59	60			62		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	228
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
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	31	Yes	4	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			

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%
FRL	45			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	54			

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	39			41			47					68
SWD	24			27			18				5	61
ELL	28			35			46				5	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			13							2	
HSP	37			42			47				5	67
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	48			48							2	
FRL	38			39			50				5	67

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	43	58	45	52	66	60	43					60
SWD	20	37	38	26	42	37	8					50
ELL	34	56	48	50	67	63	35					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			67								
HSP	41	58	47	49	65	59	42					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65	60		61	67							
FRL	43	58	49	52	67	62	41					60

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	38	28	41	45	47	29					62
SWD	12	17	9	24	42	30	22					73
ELL	35	54		36	37	40	27					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			27								
HSP	40	43	30	38	39	44	30					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42			68								
FRL	37	35	28	40	43	47	25					61

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	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	54%	-19%	58%	-23%
03	2023 - Spring	26%	46%	-20%	50%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	39%	55%	-16%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	59%	-17%	61%	-19%
05	2023 - Spring	27%	53%	-26%	55%	-28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	47%	-6%	51%	-10%

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.

The lowest performance came from 3rd grade ELA. Some of the factors that could contribute to these scores is that in kindergarten and 1st grade they were coming to school during COVID. They also finished their Kindergarten year virtually. Some students also attended school virtually while they were in 1st grade. When they were in 2nd grade there was a permanent substitute for the entire year. For 3rd grade there was another permanent substitute which led to a lot of instability which then led to gaps in their learning and behavior issues.

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

The greatest decline was in 5th grade Math and the factor that led to this decline was a large ESE group.

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 when compared to the state average was the 3rd grade ELA scores. Some of the factors that could contribute to these scores is that in kindergarten and 1st grade they were coming to school during COVID. They also finished their Kindergarten year virtually. Some students also attended school virtually while they were in 1st grade. When they were in 2nd grade there was a permanent substitute for the entire year. For 3rd grade there was another permanent substitute which led to a lot of instability which then led to gaps in their learning and behavior issues.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was 4th grade ELA. The actions that the school took to improve was having a new reading coach, having dedicated common planning time weekly, and having two reading endorsed teachers that teach ELA all day.

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

Two concerns that we have are absencies and tardies.

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

1. Using the BEST Benchmarks to drive instructional decisions.
2. Understanding and Utilizing the MTSS process.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

The principal is new at the school and had to fill 17 vacancies upon arrival. Due to the fact we have new so many new teachers, the focus is on building culture and retaining new and previous hires.

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

85% of new and returning teachers will return during the 24-25 school year.

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

Admin is providing layered support for all new teachers from the instructional coaches and mentors within the school. Admin will meet with instructional coaches weekly to discuss new hires and next steps as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacquelyn Isajar (jacquelyn.isajar@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.)

Admin has created a weekly walkthrough schedule with feedback to the teachers. Admin will also provide feedback after formal observation using the district rubric.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Admin has strategically chosen areas of focus for walkthroughs and feedback. This will help strengthen and build relationships with teachers to stay transparent and offer support.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

In order for teachers to understand standards and have time to grade level plan and collaborate, the school has implemented common planning where coverage is provided.

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

Since common planning is implemented, the teachers will have a better understanding of the BEST benchmarks and instructional guides, Therefore, ELA proficiency will improve by 15% and Math proficiency will improve by 20%.

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

Each grade level has a data wall where all common grade level assessments are documented. Data chats will be monitored quarterly by the instructional coaches to monitor next steps for instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tara Logie (tara.logie@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.)

According to Hattie, "When actions are in the range of 0.40 and above, the data suggest that the learning extends beyond that which was expected from attending school for a year." When looking at instructional coaching it has a score of 0.88 and professional learning has a score of 0.41.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are using this strategy to help teachers better understand the BEST Benchmarks and the instructional guides. This strategy will then transfer into the classroom where teachers will have a stronger understanding of the benchmarks for them to implement.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

The Literacy, Math, and Behavior coaches are paid for out of Title 1 funding. The coaches are planning weekly with teachers, providing coaching cycles, providing one on one support to new or struggling teachers, and meeting weekly with Admin to discuss data and school/grade level trends.

Title 1 funds are also being used to provide substitutes to teachers for data chats, MTSS meetings, and side by side coaching to teachers.

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

In order for teachers to understand standards and have time to grade level plan and collaborate, the school has implemented common planning where coverage is provided. The percentage of students who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on statewide assessments is at 65%.

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

In order for teachers to understand standards and have time to grade level plan and collaborate, the school has implemented common planning where coverage is provided. 32% of students are proficient according to FSA data. The grade levels that are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on statewide assessments are grades 3rd-5th.

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

Our goal is for our K-2 students to be at 50% or higher on their ELA statewide assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our goal is for our 3-5 students to be at 50% or higher on their ELA statewide assessment.

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.

Each grade level has a data wall where all common grade level assessments are documented. Data chats will be quarterly by the instructional coaches to monitor next steps for instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wilsey, Adriana, adriana.wilsey@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?

In grades K-2, will be implementing whole group UFLI and will be progress monitoring students weekly. We will be using these assessments to track students that need more support and that will need to be

pulled into small groups.
In grades 3-5, will be using Wonders and using the Spotlight assessments.

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?

In grades K-2, we are using UFLI because it is a research-based program that Florida has researched, and it matches our BEST standards.
In grades 3-5, Spotlight Checks will be given as a practice for statewide assessments that students will see throughout the year.

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
The school will build into our Professional Learning by completing a book study. The ELA teachers in grades K-5 will be reading "Shifting The Balance." This book study will deeper our understanding of the science of reading.	Isajar, Jacquelyn, jacquelyn.isajar@hcps.net
The school will be providing coaching to new teachers and teachers in need.	Isajar, Jacquelyn, jacquelyn.isajar@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 will hold a Title 1 meeting to share with parents of our SIP goals. For Staff, we will discuss our SIP plan and goals during preplanning.

Website: https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/domain/3711

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))

We are planning curriculum nights, Title 1 parent nights, and a resource center for parents. During the school year we will hold conference nights and send home monthly progress alerts. We will choose another group of 5th grade girls to become our Tiara Girls. This group of students will learn what inspires them and how can they become successful in their personal and academic life.

Website: https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/davis

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))

We plan to follow the master schedule including minute to minute academics and teachers working collaboratively with the coaches weekly.

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