

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Frost 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	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Frost Elementary School

3950 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[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 are committed to prepare individual learners for success in life with a positive, student-centered community that supports high expectations for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing lasting imprints for lifelong learning.

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
Lewis, Temeka	Principal	Responsible for full operations and achievement of Frost Elementary school. Provides strategic direction to the school, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent and community involvement, revising policies and procedures, administering the budget, hiring and evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.
English, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Providing strategic direction to the school, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent and community involvement, revising policies and procedures, evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, Frost elementary held monthly SAC meetings discussing topics related to the school improvement plan. Areas discussed during meetings included: attendance, behavior data and incentives, testing data and incentives, and forms of communication. Using data from state and district formative assessments, we discussed and developed the areas of focus during our final SAC meeting. During this meeting, current SAC members also participated in voting for new SAC members for the 2023-2024 school year.

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))

During the 2023-2024 school year, we will regularly revisit our SIP after each formative assessment. We will review data, review action steps, and make adjustments based on student needs. The SIP will be reviewed after each FAST and STAR progress monitoring assessment.

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	86%
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) 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: 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	44	22	20	24	16	0	0	0	126	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	4	6	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	24	20	0	0	0	0	44	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	18	0	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	27	31	0	0	0	85	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	30	47	0	0	0	104	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	8	4	17	23	18	0	0	0	88	

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	1	1	4	12	7	0	0	0	25

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	1	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	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	3	23	24	15	22	19	0	0	0	106	
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	1	4	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	18	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	22	27	0	0	0	66	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	21	21	21	19	17	20	0	0	0	119	

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	1	2	7	3	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	3	23	24	15	22	19	0	0	0	106	
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	1	4	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	18	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	22	27	0	0	0	66	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	21	21	21	19	17	20	0	0	0	119	

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	1	2	7	3	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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*	51	50	53	46	53	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				49			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			60		
Math Achievement*	42	56	59	47	50	50	42		
Math Learning Gains				55			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			33		
Science Achievement*	41	50	54	43	59	59	26		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	57			79		

* 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
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	48

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	386
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	9	Yes	3	2
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	54			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	50			

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	18	Yes	2	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	49			

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	64			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	47			

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	51			42			41					64
SWD	11			15			0				3	
ELL	50			38							4	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47			38			32				4	
HSP	53			41			41				5	63
MUL	47			59							2	
PAC												
WHT	57			39			50				3	
FRL	49			40			33				5	59

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	49	37	47	55	52	43					57
SWD	4	11	18	14	43							
ELL	39	50		52	63		58					57
AMI												
ASN												

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	37	53	42	40	50	40	27					
HSP	44	43	36	45	51	64	47					60
MUL	53	60		73	70							
PAC												
WHT	64	42		52	64							
FRL	40	50	38	44	54	50	41					56

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	45	47	60	42	40	33	26					79
SWD	25			30								
ELL	41	57		33	44		18					79
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	38		34	28	30	21					
HSP	41	58		35	46		28					79
MUL	71			73								
PAC												
WHT	61			57								
FRL	40	44	64	39	36	36	24					79

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	44%	53%	-9%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	59%	-22%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	47%	-11%	51%	-15%

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.

In the 2022-2023 school year, math proficiency decreased by 3% from 47% proficiency to 44% proficiency. This is due to the implementation of new standards and curriculum and a lack of professional development and common planning during this time.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is the math proficiency in grades 3-5.

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 with the greatest gap compared to the state average is 4th grade math. The state average is 61% and our school's average is 31%.

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

The data with the most improvement was third grade ELA with 54% proficiency, higher than the state average and district average.

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

Our potential areas of concern are attendance and students absent 0% or more days. Our second concern is Level 1 on statewide math assessments in grades 3-5.

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

1. Math proficiency in grades 3-5.
2. Use of small group instruction model
3. Common planning with math and literacy coaches
4. Monthly professional development

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 Math**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 the 2022-2023 school year, math proficiency decreased by 3% from 47% proficiency to 44% proficiency. 60% of students who are assessed with FAST will demonstrate learning gains. This is due to the implementation of new standards and curriculum and a lack of professional development and common planning during this time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

According to the FAST assessment, 50% of our students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in math on the Spring 2024 administration. According to the FSAA, 50% of our students will demonstrate proficiency. 60% of students with disabilities who are assessed with FSAA will demonstrate learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, students will participate in district math quarterly monitoring tests (QMT) and math StemScopes unit assessments after each quarter and unit to monitor student progress. Students will also be assessed using math iReady Diagnostic and 50% of students will show proficiency on FAST and iReady Diagnostic and 80% of students will demonstrate learning gains on FAST and iReady Diagnostic.

Common planning sessions will be led by resource coaches and extended from 30 minutes to 60 minutes per week during the 2023-2024 school year. During common planning, we will internalize grade-level benchmarks, develop rigorous lesson plans and learning tasks aligned with grade level benchmarks. Teachers will be provided coaching cycles if necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Temeka Lewis (temeka.lewis@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.)

Structure C differentiated small group instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows increased achievement and student confidence when students receive small group instruction.

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.

Coaches and Administrators will lead common planning sessions using B.E.S.T. standards and benchmarks. Coaches will help teachers internalize grade-level benchmarks, develop rigorous lesson plans and learning tasks aligned to standards and benchmarks. Internalization will focus on increasing teacher content knowledge of grade level benchmarks.

Teachers will implement a structure C small group rotation schedule to instruct students.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will be identified for targeted small group instruction during the school day and after school during extended learning program (ELP).

Teachers will participate in on-going professional development on StemScopes curriculum.

Person Responsible: Temeka Lewis (temeka.lewis@hcps.net)

By When: This will be monitored daily

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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 the 2022-2023 school year, based on STAR assessment, K-2 reading proficiency was 42%. Grade two students were significantly lower with 36% proficiency. 80% of rising first and second grade students will show learning gains on the STAR assessment. This was a direct result of the implementation of new standards and curriculum and a lack of professional development and planning for teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will be measured using the STAR assessment. 50% of students will 80% of rising first and second grade students will show learning gains on the STAR assessment.

Monitoring:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, students will participate in district DIBEL monitoring assessments three times per year. 80% of K-2 students will demonstrate mastery and a progressive increase of foundational reading skills according to the DIBELS assessment.

Students will also be assessed using reading iReady Diagnostic and STAR. 50% of students will show proficiency on STAR and iReady Diagnostic and 80% of students in grades 1 and 2 will demonstrate learning gains on STAR and iReady Diagnostic.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will utilize iReady magnetic readers for small group instruction and 80% of students will demonstrate ongoing growth utilizing the embedded "Connected" magnetic reader assessments.

80% of students will demonstrate ongoing growth in reading foundational skills as measured by UFLI weekly assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Temeka Lewis (temeka.lewis@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.)

Teachers will participate in 60 minutes of weekly common planning sessions focusing on a dedicated time each week to focus on the implementation of UFLI. Weekly common planning sessions will be led by coaches and administrators.

Teachers will participate in professional development training around the science of reading and the implementation of UFLI, Magnetic Reader, and

Teachers will participate in quarterly data chats to analyze both school and district-based data to determine and develop individual student's instructional paths.

Teachers will utilize various data sources to plan for and implement purposeful small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This was a direct result of the implementation of new standards and curriculum and a lack of professional development and planning for teachers.

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

#3. 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.

Effective communication is essential for building school-family partnerships. It constitutes the foundation for

all other forms of family involvement in education. We work to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. School staff, students, parents, and community, work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home newsletters and flyers, making parent link calls, and posting everything on our website and social media platforms. Parents are invited to join SAC and PTA. Each committee meets monthly to discuss budget, events, and student needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome will be to increase student attendance through parent involvement and positive behavior intervention systems. Based on last year's, we had 106 students absent 10% or more days.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor student attendance using EdConnect and LiveSchool as a form of student incentive for attendance.

We are partnering with USF and the Children's Board as a trauma informed school and will collect data using our Panorama Survey.

We will use sign-in sheets to monitor attendance of parents when volunteering and attending school-wide events.

We have implemented weekly SEL lessons in all grade levels.

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.)

Our goal is to increase parent involvement through volunteering and participation in family engagement activities such, SAC, PTA, STEM nights, ESOL parent meetings, and quarterly family night events. We will also use LiveSchool as a form of communication and PBIS.

We have incorporated weekly SEL sessions for all grade levels. We have also partnered with USF and the Children's Board as a trauma informed school and will collect data using Panorama.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The John Hattie data effect size shows that parent involvement is .50 and that behavioral intervention programs are .62 and SEL is .92

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).

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement schools- Our targeted subgroup needing additional support and improvement is our SWD subgroup. Funding will be used to provide students with additional learning opportunities through extended learning programs (ELP) and funds will be used to purchase additional curriculum and supplies to support this program.

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

*Weekly standards-based instructional planning.

K-2 teachers, VE, and ESOL Resource Teachers will participate in grade level/subject area planning sessions with reading coach and RTI coach. Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Microsoft Teams.

Through planning, the reading coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support all subgroups of students in order to increase achievement.

RTI resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group.

Teachers will participate in site-based BEST standards professional development monthly with the

reading coach.

Planning for small group instruction and implementation will take place during site-based planning sessions.

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

*Weekly standards-based instructional planning.

K-2 teachers, VE, and ESOL Resource Teachers will participate in grade level/subject area planning sessions with reading coach and RTI coach. Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Microsoft Teams.

Through planning, the reading coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support all subgroups of students in order to increase achievement.

RTI resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group.

Teachers will participate in site-based BEST standards professional development monthly with the reading coach.

Planning for small group instruction and implementation will take place during site-based planning sessions.

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

Student proficiency will be 50% in reading based on the 2023-2024 STAR assessment by the end of the school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Student proficiency will be 58% in reading based on 2023-2024 FAST assessment by the end of the school year.

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.

During the 2023-2024 school year, students will participate in district DIBEL monitoring assessments three times per year. 80% of K-2 students will demonstrate mastery and a progressive increase of foundational reading skills according to the DIBELS assessment.

Students will also be assessed using reading iReady Diagnostic and STAR. 50% of students will show proficiency on STAR and iReady Diagnostic and 80% of students in grades 1 and 2 will demonstrate learning gains on STAR and iReady Diagnostic.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will utilize iReady magnetic readers for small group instruction and 80% of students will demonstrate ongoing growth utilizing the embedded “Connected” magnetic reader assessments.

80% of students will demonstrate ongoing growth in reading foundational skills as measured by UFLI weekly assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lewis, Temeka, temeka.lewis@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?

K-5 teachers will utilize Wonders curriculum and iReady magnetic readers to implement the BEST standards, when planning instruction. Teachers will also utilize Flamingo literacy for small group instruction and implement UFLI phonics instruction on a daily basis. Teachers will plan with a site-based reading coach. Planning will place emphasis on whole group and small group instruction.

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?

Programs selected are research-based and have shown proven effectiveness if implemented with fidelity daily.

Curriculum selected will focus on reading foundational skills, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension and reading strategies to support all students. Curriculum includes Wonders, iReady, UFLI, SIPPS, and Flamingo Literacy.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Leadership Standards-based instructional planning K-5 reading teachers, VE, and ESOL Resources Teachers will participate in grade level/ subject area planning sessions with reading coach and RTI coach. Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Microsoft Teams. Planning templates will be made available for all teachers in order to align their work with these subgroups.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching Through planning, the reading coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support all students in order to increase achievement. RTI resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group.</p> <p>Professional Learning Teachers will participate in site-based BEST standards professional development monthly with the reading coach and attend district professional development trainings. Planning for small group instruction and implementation will take place during site-based planning sessions.</p> <p>Assessment STAR, FAST, DIBELS, and iReady diagnostic all taken three times a year.</p>	<p>Lewis, Temeka, temeka.lewis@hcps.net</p>

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.

An email and Parentlink was sent to all stakeholders.

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))

Effective communication is essential for building school-family partnerships. It constitutes the foundation for

all other forms of family involvement in education. We work to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. School staff, students, parents, and community, work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home newsletters

and flyers, making parent link calls, and posting everything on our website and social media platforms. Parents are invited to join SAC and PTA. Each committee meets monthly to discuss budget, events, and student needs.

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))

Our academic program will be strengthened with 60-minute weekly planning sessions, data chats, and monthly professional development sessions.

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))

All of our school-wide programs including Head Start, VPK, Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) which allows all of our students to receive a free healthy breakfast and lunch, Suncoast Community Health mobile dental programs, vision screenings and hearing screenings are all available to provide comprehensive support and improvement of student outcomes.