Doby Elementary School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Doby Elementary School

6720 COVINGTON GARDEN DR, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

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.

Doby Navigators will achieve and grow through rigorous instruction and quality resources.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Doby Navigators lead and achieve by being caring, cooperative, and courageous.

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
Fuller, Bradley	Principal	Oversees all aspects of school including curriculum, instruction, student achievement and behavior management. Liaison between families, district and state personnel, faculty and staff. Responsible for facility maintenance, budgets, hiring, etc.
Fedele, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	Oversees all aspects of school including curriculum, instruction, student achievement and behavior management. Liaison between families, district and state personnel, faculty and staff.
Bowser, Pamela	SAC Member	Oversee SAC committee.
Hausmann, Kristy	Instructional Coach	Helps support our staff with reading instruction.
Colon, Luis	ELL Compliance Specialist	Helps support our staff with ELL resources
McDonnell, Stephanie	Attendance/Social Work	Helps support our families and students through attendance and other resources.

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.

We have created the SIP as a leadership team, which will then be read and voted on by the staff as well as the SAC.

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))

The SIP will be monitored quarterly by the Instructional Leadership Team

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
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: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	2	33	29	24	23	24	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	1	4	7	0	0	0	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	42	18	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	27	20	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	34	17	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	32	31	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	20	18	23	32	31	0	0	0	131

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	1	1	0	2	16	17	0	0	0	37

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	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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	30	19	26	26	15	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	19	27	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	39	23	42	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	12	36	19	27	0	0	0	102

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	0	4	12	1	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	2	11	1	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	30	19	26	26	15	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	19	27	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	39	23	42	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	12	36	19	27	0	0	0	102

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	0	4	12	1	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	2	11	1	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	46	50	53	55	53	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				58			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			35		
Math Achievement*	55	56	59	55	50	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				71			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			20		
Science Achievement*	58	50	54	48	59	59	54		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	59	59	63			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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	252
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	57

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	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	21	Yes	3	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	43			

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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
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	50			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	55			

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	46			55			58					59
SWD	15			33			30				4	
ELL	30			44							4	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			38			41				4	
HSP	41			53			53				5	64
MUL	54			69							2	
PAC												
WHT	47			60			75				4	
FRL	39			48			45				5	57

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	55	58	51	55	71	57	48					63
SWD	24	35	31	30	64	53	23					
ELL	43	52		38	62	60						63
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	45	56	53	34	54	53	36					
HSP	51	55	38	47	67	71	43					63
MUL	54			46								
PAC												
WHT	63	61	55	71	83		61					
FRL	47	57	57	42	64	71	37					64

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	53	50	35	47	58	20	54					61
SWD	12	27	29	19	38	25	12					
ELL	32			25								61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	53		35	40		40					
HSP	43	11		31	44		45					63
MUL	53			47								
PAC												
WHT	61	63		60	71		64					
FRL	45	50	42	36	49	20	43					58

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	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	58%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	34%	46%	-12%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	55%	1%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	59%	-8%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	51%	1%

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.

Reading Proficiency: The previous year we had 18 retained students in third-grade students. This number of struggling students made proficiency in third grade challenging. Third grade proficiency was at 34% while fourth and fifth were at 54% and 60% respectively.

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

Reading Proficiency: The previous year we had 18 retained students in third-grade students. This number of struggling students made proficiency in third grade challenging. Third grade proficiency was at 34% while fourth and fifth were at 54% and 60% respectively.

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.

Reading Proficiency: The previous year we had 18 retained students in third-grade students. This number of struggling students made proficiency in third grade challenging. Third grade proficiency was at 34% while fourth and fifth were at 54% and 60% respectively.

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

Science showed the greatest improvement from the previous year, going from 48% to 57% proficient.

Focus on science from K-5 has led to this change as well as organized data analysis from science assessment being used to guide instruction.

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

A high number of students who are on our list of risks for attendance.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Learning gains in reading and math
3. Attendance number

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.

The area that was chosen was our ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities. This was chosen because for the last two years, Doby has been below the 41% cutoff for the Federal Index.

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

Students who fall in the ESSA Subgroup SWD will have an increase of 5%. Our goal is to be above the 41% cutoff for the Federal Index.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through walkthrough, observation, and assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Fuller (bradley.fuller@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 focus on supportive and collaborative planning for small group differentiated instruction based on the needs of students, with frequent progress monitoring and feedback for students.

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

According to Visible Learning effect size
- Planning +.76
- Small Group Instruction +.47
- Feedback +.62

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.

Professional Development with a focus on small group instruction with assessment and feedback

Person Responsible: Bradley Fuller (bradley.fuller@hcps.net)

By When: Preplanning

PLC three times a monthto collaborate and plan small group instruction as well as assessments that will help determine students' level of understanding.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Fedele (rebecca.fedele@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

ILT will meet monthly to problem solve issues/concerns at the PLC level and monitor data.

Person Responsible: Bradley Fuller (bradley.fuller@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

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.)

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

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.

One area of focus is our student attendance. We had 135 students who were on the early warning system based on their attendance.

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

Our goal is to decrease the number of students on the early warning system by 20%

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

Monthly through our Student Service meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie McDonnell (stephanie.mcdonnell@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 are doing a combination of working on our Tier 1 support for teachers and students with positive incentives. as well as Tier 3 interventions with students and families through parent conferences, home visits, and communication from the teacher, school social worker, and administration.

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

We are trying to work school-wide on attendance as well as provide the extra support to those who are in need of intensive interventions (Tier 3).

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.

Information and action plan for all faculty in staff

Person Responsible: Stephanie McDonnell (stephanie.mcdonnell@hcps.net)

By When: Preplanning

Monthly data analysis of our attendance through Student Service meeting

Person Responsible: Stephanie McDonnell (stephanie.mcdonnell@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

Support for teachers to learn more about communication with parents about attendance through parent conferences and home visits

Person Responsible: Stephanie McDonnell (stephanie.mcdonnell@hcps.net)

By When: Preplanning

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

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.)

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

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).

NA

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

This year there has been an addition of the UFLI program, which is a return to the basics of reading fundamentals. Our teachers have been trained and are using it along with Dibels assessment to determine students who are not on track to be a Level 3 or higher and differentiate based on their specific needs.

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

An instructional practice that we will be incorporating is through differentiated instruction based on data from PM3 last year as well as PM1 this year. Our cohort of third grade who was at 36% proficient has been identified and extra support will be provided through not only Tier 1 instruction, but also opportunities for tutoring.

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 to have 62% of our students in grades K-2 on the statewide ELA assessment

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Last year, we were at 49% proficient on our 3rd-5th grade FAST test. Our goal for this year is that each grade level will be at least 62% proficient on the end of year 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.

Monitoring will be done on multiple levels. We will be looking school-wide at common assessments (FAST, I-Ready, Standards Mastery, etc.) This ongoing data will be broken down by grade level, sub group, teacher, and student to look for trends and where support is needed.

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

Fuller, Bradley, bradley.fuller@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?

Our instructional priorities are:
1. Providing opportunities for students to have productive struggle with differentiated instruction (provided through small group instruction)
2. Providing assessment and feedback for students and teachers to know what the area of needs are for students (Feedback which leads to planning)

This goes along with Hattie's areas of growth
According to Visible Learning effect size
- Planning +.76
- Small Group Instruction +.47
- Feedback +.62

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?

We see that the data supports the need for differentiated instruction. With 36% of our current fourth graders being proficient, we need to use Tier 2, Tier 3, and ESE support to close the gap. With proper small group instruction, along with assessment, feedback and continuous planning, we will be able to close the gap for this cohort of students.

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
We will provide professional development for teachers in all grade levels on the importance of small group instruction as well as assessment/feedback and its impact on planning. This is done through support of our literacy leadership team led by our Reading Coach. This PD will be during preplanning as well as ongoing throughout the year to look at the current data, discuss implications of instructional strategies, and provide opportunities to collaborate among the reading teachers with support from our reading coach.	Hausmann, Kristy, kristy.hausmann@hcps.net
Ongoing data analysis to determine the successs we are seeing throughout the year. This data analysis will be looked at on multiple levels, starting with our Leadership team, our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) at the Professional Learning Community (PLC), subgroups, and down to individual student. We will meet quarterly to look at the overall impact of these common assessments and adjust our plan as needed.	Fuller, Bradley, bradley.fuller@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.

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes