

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Collins Pk 8 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	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Collins Pk 8 School

12424 SUMMERFIELD BLVD, Riverview, FL 33579

[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.

Collins Elementary students will be compassionate, respectful, responsible learners who become successful citizens.

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
Sargable, Rebecca	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Smiley, Ron	Assistant Principal	Serves as the assistant instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Colston, Tonya	Assistant Principal	Serves as the assistant instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.

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.

Our SAC Team is comprised of representatives from all stakeholders. Input is gathered throughout the school year and the summer from various members of our school family to ensure stakeholder involvement with the development of our School Improvement Plan.

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))

Collins PK-8 is always focused on continuous improvement. We engage all stakeholders and meet multiple times a month to ensure our students are progressing appropriately with the grade level standards. We interpret data and make a plan for intervention and progress monitoring for students that need additional support. We will revise the SIP, as needed to appropriately support our students.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	37	44	28	28	29	34	41	24	265	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	2	7	23	20	55	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	40	26	30	37	32	1	166	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	41	48	30	22	1	167	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level 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	13	24	29	48	48	24	186

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	1	5	0	0	0	1	8	4	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	2	34	42	30	23	21	0	0	0	152	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	29	26	0	0	0	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	34	30	0	0	0	97	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	15	0	12	7	0	0	0	35	

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	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	2	34	42	30	23	21	0	0	0	152	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	29	26	0	0	0	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	34	30	0	0	0	97	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	15	0	12	7	0	0	0	35	

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	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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*	52	51	53	60	51	55	57		
ELA Learning Gains				65			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			32		
Math Achievement*	57	50	55	62	41	42	51		
Math Learning Gains				73			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			53		
Science Achievement*	55	48	52	55	48	54	42		
Social Studies Achievement*		65	68		57	59			
Middle School Acceleration		70	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	67	52	55	69	73	70	61		

* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	272
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	44			

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	51			
HSP	54			

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%
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	52			

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	52			57			55					67
SWD	19			31			31				4	
ELL	36			56							4	67
AMI												
ASN	64			73							3	70
BLK	41			46			33				4	
HSP	49			55			58				5	67
MUL	61			79			64				4	
PAC												
WHT	59			59			65				4	
FRL	42			47			39				5	68

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	60	65	51	62	73	53	55					69
SWD	29	51	49	24	48	52	29					
ELL	42	47		47	63		36					69
AMI												
ASN	91			100								

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
BLK	44	55	52	42	64	60	40					
HSP	58	56	29	60	67	44	53					67
MUL	74	67		68	72		57					
PAC												
WHT	67	76	76	71	80	52	64					
FRL	49	56	46	44	64	53	40					65

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	57	49	32	51	53	53	42					61
SWD	19	33	39	30	35	47	14					40
ELL	34			47								61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	40	36	27	32		14					
HSP	52	41	36	50	52	57	41					54
MUL	57			50			27					
PAC												
WHT	69	62		62	64	60	55					
FRL	43	39	35	37	47	45	30					57

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	65%	53%	12%	54%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	46%	-6%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	47%	7%	51%	3%

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.

Based on the data the data component that showed the lowest performance was SWD ELA proficiency at 20%.

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

Some of the contributing factors was trying to reteach and build a stamina for learning. Gaps in foundational skills in the areas of early reading, vocabulary, and comprehension continue to contribute to learning struggle in the area of ELA. New ELA Benchmark standards also contributed to the decline in student proficiency in the data component of SWD.

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 data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state was Math Lowest 25th percentile.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math learning gains. Successful implementation of Math quarterlies across grade levels contributed to this improvement. PLC planning by

grade level and vertical planning contribute, as well as Data PLCs to analyze areas of need for individual classes as well as grade level trends.

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

Based on the EWS data from Part 1 two areas of potential concern are SWD ELA, math, and science proficiency.

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

1. SWD ELA proficiency
2. SWD Math proficiency
3. SWD Science proficiency

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

One area of focus is our SWD students who were 29% proficient in ELA, 24% proficient in math and 29% proficient in Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

62% of K-8 students will show proficiency on the state assessment by PM 3 in Spring 2024 including our SWD students.

Monitoring:

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

BQ students in ELA and math will be monitored throughout the year based on unit assessments and benchmark aligned tasks. Utilizing scheduled PLCs we can discuss trends in student achievement and plan accordingly to meet the needs of our students in both whole group and small group.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ron Smiley (ron.smiley@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.)

We will utilize Math Quarterly Assessments, ELA Spotlights Benchmarks and Unit Assessments (District) and the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking PM 1 and PM 2 to monitor our students, as well as Brain Spring (K-5), Structures (Grade 6) and I-Spire (Grades 7 & 8).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

District created assessments (Math Quarterly and ELA Spotlight and Unit Assessment Benchmarks) have targeted goals to assess what students have previously learned in classroom instruction and teachers can monitor student learning through these assessments. These researched based interventions are aligned to meet the needs of our SWD students to help them close learning 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.

Grade levels will utilize scheduled monthly PLCs to discuss how lessons, tasks, and assessments will be differentiated and supplemented to support learning gaps for all students.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

By When:

Using ELA and math data, teachers will provide interventions to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students that will help close learning gaps for all students.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@hcps.net)

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

One area of focus Collins PK-8 will be to focus on the social -emotional learning of all students to promote inclusivity and acceptance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will continue to implement the 7 Mindsets curriculum, to ensure a safe, caring environment where all stakeholders feel emotionally, socially, and physically safe which will ensure a positive school culture.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the 7 Mindsets dashboard to ensure fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Sargable (rebecca.sargable@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.)

7 Mindsets curriculum will be utilized on a weekly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are using research based curriculum to address students social and emotional needs which will help create a positive learning environment for all students.

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 description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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)).

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

We will utilize whole group phonics instruction using UFLI, a foundational skills program to increase phonemic awareness, decoding, and fluency of our K-2 students in order to help them become successful to be proficient when they reach 3rd grade.

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

We will provide daily small group instruction to all students in order to meet their learning needs, and help increase their foundational skills and fluency, to help increase their comprehension skills in order to show proficiency by the end of 3rd grade.

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

We will use progress monitoring of STAR Early Literacy, Star Reading, and DIBELS three times a year to monitor student growth and areas of need.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will use progress monitoring of FAST and DIBELS three times a year, as well as bi-weekly spotlights and Unit Assessments of our reading benchmarks to monitor student growth and areas of need.

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.

Through the process of MTSS and PLCs, we will monitor student growth and data. Monthly data PLCs will allow teachers to discuss student growth and find areas that still need improvement. Students who continue to show areas of need will be Tiered and provided interventions to help them progress towards mastery of benchmarks. Students who continue to show a need for support can be recommended to PSLT on the school level.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sargable, Rebecca, rebecca.sargable@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?

Using a whole group phonics approach provides all students access to foundational skills in phonemic awareness, blending, segmenting, decoding, and fluency. Using UFLI for 30 minutes daily provides aligns with our districts Literacy For All movement within reading to help close the gaps of the foundational skills in our primary grades (K-3). The intertwining of concepts helps provide a multitude of practice for students through the reading block. Small group interventions using the program as well provide additional support for those students that need more support in different areas.

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?

Using UFLI as core foundational phonics program daily within our primary classrooms has shown to have effect sizes of 1.2 in some grades to help close the gap in foundational gap in our primary students. This evidence-based practice and program align with the districts Literacy for All Reading Plan to help promote growth in our primary grades and supports the foundational benchmarks as well. A systematic scope and sequence of phonics instruction will help build students ability to decode text, and as a result increase their comprehension as they enter 3rd grade.

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
Professional development of UFLI as well as ongoing support of modeling and coaching of the program in classrooms.	Sargable, Rebecca, rebecca.sargable@hcps.net
Grade levels (K-3) will utilize PLCS monthly to discuss the effectiveness of lessons, tasks, and weekly progress monitoring assessments within the UFLI program and impact on mastery of reading benchmarks. Teachers will modify instruction based on progress monitoring assessments in foundational skills and comprehension to see where areas of need are to be addressed.	Sargable, Rebecca, rebecca.sargable@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.

-

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))

-

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)

-

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))

-

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

-

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

-

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

-

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

-

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

-