

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cannella 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	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Cannella Elementary School

10707 NIXON RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[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.

Reaching for the Stars! SOARing Together!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cannella Elementary will prepare 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
Ventura, Angela	Principal	The principal is responsible for administering and supervising the total school program and providing educational leadership for the students and staff members consistent with the educational goals of the community. These goals include establishing a climate conducive to learning, defining roles, planning and coordinating programs, effecting change, and decision-making.
Beltran, Lizzette	Assistant Principal	Under direction of the principal, assists with administering and supervising the total school program and providing educational leadership for students and staff members consistent with the educational goals of the community. These goals include establishing a climate conducive to learning, planning, and coordinating programs, affecting change, and decision making.
Morgan, Krystina	SAC Member	SAC Chair and Grade Level Team Leader. Other members of the School Leadership Team include grade level instructional Team Leaders, Academic Coaches, ESE Specialist, Media Center/Technology Lead, and School Advisory Council team members.

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.

Stakeholders analyzed school wide data and reflected on areas of celebration and areas of growth. We discussed practices that worked well and may have attributed to students' areas of success and areas of growth, and support needed for students and staff.

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 Instructional Leadership Team meets monthly. After the baseline STAR and FAST, we will analyze results, discuss progress towards proficiency goals, and adjust schoolwide goals to increase proficiency rates in ELA and Math. Throughout the year, other assessments will be discussed to measure growth, such as DIBELs, iReady Diagnostic data, PM2 data, Quarterly Math Assessments.

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	80%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	25	25	20	27	25	0	0	0	122	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	25	27	0	0	0	0	52	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	22	30	0	0	0	0	52	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	27	11	0	0	0	63	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	21	11	0	0	0	48	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	11	9	37	33	0	0	0	104	
	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	0	14	12	0	0	0	26

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	24	21	21	19	12	0	0	0	97	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	21	14	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	10	0	0	0	25	
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		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	24	21	21	19	12	0	0	0	97	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	21	14	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	10	0	0	0	25	
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		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	48	50	53	58	53	56	56		
ELA Learning Gains				64			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			18		
Math Achievement*	59	56	59	67	50	50	60		
Math Learning Gains				70			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			48		
Science Achievement*	49	50	54	51	59	59	51		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	59	59	76			58		

** 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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	248
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
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	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	28	Yes	4	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	63			
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	61			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			59			49					57
SWD	11			24			25				5	73
ELL	33			49			53				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	61			61			44				4	
HSP	45			51			41				5	56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44			65			52				4	
FRL	44			55			49				5	55

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	58	64	43	67	70	59	51					76
SWD	11	38	35	29	62	46	6					
ELL	54	48		75	70		25					76
AMI												
ASN	91	82		100	91							
BLK	54	72		57	69	70	54					
HSP	59	60	35	66	70	56	44					78
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52	68		66	75							
FRL	57	62	39	67	72	67	49					78

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	56	51	18	60	53	48	51					58
SWD	8	14		18	36	30	0					
ELL	48	45	18	56	45	50	30					58
AMI												
ASN	69			81								
BLK	56			32								
HSP	55	53	25	61	54	47	49					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	27		71	64		55					
FRL	53	49	20	57	51	50	46					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	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	54%	-9%	58%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	46%	-13%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	55%	-1%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	59%	-7%	61%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	53%	14%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	51%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The lowest performance data was in ELA overall, especially in 3rd and SWD. We continue needing to focus on targeted support for SWD in all grade levels and students who are struggling with foundational reading skills.

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

The great decline from the prior year data was in ELA overall proficiency from FSA 58% to FAST PM 3 48%. Students continue needing support in foundational literacy skills that were not learned or reinforced during COVID instructional interruptions.

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.

Grades 3 and 4 ELA overall data and SWD scores had the greatest gaps as compared to the state average. Contributing factors include need to target foundational literacy skills, such as decoding and comprehension skills, as well as applications as they skills.

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

Overall, mathematics scores showed the most improvement. Our school continues focusing on using data to drive instructional practices. Teachers use class exit tickets, quarterly monthly assessments, and district data tools to drive planning and practice. Therefore, are clear on students' instructional needs and strengths.

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

Students overall attendance is an area of concern and ELA proficiency particularly in 3rd grade.

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

Priority #1:

Accelerate student learning by utilizing effective instructional strategies that meet the needs of all learners through planned use of Universal Design for Learning Principles, along with AVID strategies in grades 3-5, and intentional use of technology.

Priority #2:

Increase student proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science through standards-based planning, data analysis of common assessments, and ongoing reflection of teaching practices (focusing on “Four Critical Questions for PLCs”).

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

Positive culture and environment specifically relating to student attendance will focus on improving student attendance in order to positively impact student achievement, particularly with students who are chronically absent - defined as missing 10% or more of the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of all students with 90% or higher attendance rate, as measured by EdConnect, will increase as follows comparing 2022-2023 to 2023-2024 from 75% to 90%.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance, led by the MTSS team leader (SSW), will be monitored daily, monthly, and quarterly by analyzing data from EdConnect, and other data sources, in the MTSS OneNote folder. The data will be monitored and tracked to look for trends and patterns and used to intervene before chronic attendance can occur. The Data Processor will submit the daily attendance to the School Social Worker. The attendance will be reviewed so attendance plans, for students who are chronically absent, can be adjusted, if necessary. The Student Services team will meet weekly to review all data to adjust the SIP's Action Steps. The attendance team will share attendance data with the entire staff twice a month.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lizzette Beltran (lizzette.beltran@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.)

Rtl will be focused on strengthening Tier 1, 2, and 3 to improve student attendance, particularly with students with chronic absenteeism.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using Rtl for attendance is to utilize a schoolwide process that supports students at all three tiers. The following two sources document the effectiveness of Rtl:
 -John Hattie's Effect Size on Response to Intervention: 1.29
 -Kim and Streeter's Strategies and Interventions for Improving School Attendance | Encyclopedia of Social Work (oxfordre.com)

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.

TIER 1

1st - 4th absence

- a) Parent calls school—DP updates attendance
- b) Unexplained absence—School calls
- c) Teacher implements Tier 1 classroom practices.

5th Absence

- a) Automated phone call. If excused, administration may consider a doctor's note if applicable.
- b) Teacher contacts parent.
- c) Teacher implements Tier 1 classroom practices.

TIER 2

5th – 10th Absence (Excused/Unexcused)

- a) Teachers work in grade level to implement Tier 2 interventions.
- b) Teacher schedules parent conference to discuss impact of absences and documents on Cannella Attendance Tracking Form, parent conference summary form.

TIER 3

10th – 15th Absence (Excused and Unexcused)

- a) Teacher provides SSW with copy of completed Cannella Attendance Tracking Form for PSLT review.
- b) 10th absence – mandatory letter SD4138B send to parent (copy of letter is placed in cumulative folder).
- c) 15 absence – PSLT meets and reviews MTSS documentation and considers Attendance Referral to SSW (SB34507) and requires doctor's note.

Person Responsible: Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. 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.

Based on our SWD rate of progress & proficiency, we have identified the need for more targeted support for our SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Provide differentiated small groups (flexible needs, focus on foundational skills) in reading and mathematics as a result monitor and analyze students' progress on ongoing formative assessments (DIBELS, iReady, PM data, math and ELA class formative assessments) on a monthly basis.

Monitoring:

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

Observations and data analysis of formative assessments during collaborative planning sessions and leadership meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Ventura (angela.ventura@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.)

Instructional coaching, data meetings-data analysis to differentiate instruction, purposeful planning of small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of 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.

Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans for differentiated instruction (focused on foundational skills) and use of formal assessments (exit cards) to drive instructional practices (targeted small groups based on data), and monitoring of SWD performance on school and district assessments.

Person Responsible: Lizzette Beltran (lizzette.beltran@hcps.net)

By When: Quarterly

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)).

School Improvement funding allocations are reviewed monthly at Leadership and School Advisory Council meetings. SIP focus areas are reviewed and data relevant to focus areas are analyzed (attendance, instructional priorities).

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

N/A

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

Based on the 2023 ELA FAST Scores, 33% in grade 3 scored at proficiency and 47% in grade 4 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score demonstrates our need to focus on foundational literacy skills to narrow instructional gaps, while also providing rigorous opportunities. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include all students receiving high levels of rigorous instruction, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on grade 3 & 4 ELA FAST scores.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of grade 3 & 4 students scoring at grade level on the FAST assessment will be at least 20% in Grade 3 and 10% in Grade 4 higher than the previous FAST proficiency scores.

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.

Informal and formal observations and feedback, data meetings analyzing students' proficiency as measured by PM 1, 2, and 3, as well as iReady Diagnostic 1 and 2 data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ventura, Angela, angela.ventura@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?

Instructional coaching in reading, collaborative planning sessions, data meetings-data analysis to differentiate instruction, purposeful planning of small group instruction, facilitated by literacy coach.

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?

ECTAC Florida evidence based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of small group instruction.

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
Instructional coaching by literacy and district coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans for differentiated instruction and use of formal & informal assessments (exit cards) to drive instructional practices (targeted small groups based on data).	Beltran, Lizzette, lizzette.beltran@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.

The SIP is presented to the staff and parents during pre-planning, faculty, and SAC meetings. Additionally, updates on the progress of focus areas and instructional priorities are provided during faculty and SAC meetings. Stakeholder feedback is collected, and the SIP is voted on. Also, this information is on the school website <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/cannella>.

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))

At Cannella Elementary School we plan to continue building positive relationships with parents, families and other community partners to support the needs of students by continuously keeping parents informed of their child's progress, through weekly Parentlink messages, SAC and PTA meetings, Schoolwide Family Events (Conference Nights, Multicultural Night, Literacy and STEAM night). <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/cannella>

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))

Instructional coaching by academic coaches, regular feedback by administrators and coaches, during collaborative planning sessions ensure clear plans for differentiated instruction and use of formal assessments (exit cards) to drive instructional practices (targeted small groups based on data), and monitoring of SWD performance on school and district assessments.

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

N/A

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))

Weekly Student Services meetings to discuss mental health services needs and services available, attendance monitoring and parent outreach regarding community available resources.

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))

AVID implementation and focus in Grades 3-5.

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).

PBIS- Tier 1, 2, 3 plans, incentives quarterly events for students, Comet Cash and points.

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))

Ongoing instructional coaching and feedback by academic coaches and administration.

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))

Collaboration between Pre-Kindergarten teams and K- 5 teams (leadership, faculty, and planning meetings).