

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Chiaramonte Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Chiaramonte Elementary School

6001 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[ 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.**

Prepare students to become successful, productive, and responsible adults.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Provide an educational foundation that will encourage 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
Smallen, Cassandra	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Tshiamalenge, Sabrina	Assistant Principal	Serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Malberg, Paul	Instructional Coach	Serves as SAC co chair, Works with instructional staff to analyze data and provide planning support and resources
Bostwick, Renee	Other	Works with ESE teachers and students to provide individualized academic and social skills and ensure fidelity of implementation of IEP plans
Kirkner, Sandra	Other	Provide instruction for media center and facilitate check out

**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.

All stakeholders reviewed SIP plan including data used to create plan. Stakeholders were given time to review and ask questions and then voted to approve.

**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))

Instructional Leadership Team will review the SIP plan along with progress monitoring data points to include FAST Pm 1 and 2, I Ready Diagnostic 1 and 2, Math quarterlies, Science unit assessments and Wonder units assessments. Instructional Leadership Team will develop Action steps for implementation in classrooms.

**Demographic Data**  
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	60%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	18	13	7	8	15	15	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	13	10	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	5	21	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	4	1	5	13	10	0	0	0	33

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	20	10	12	7	17	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	10	13	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	8



**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	14
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	2	20	10	12	7	17	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	10	13	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	8

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	14
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*	59	50	53	52	53	56	48		
ELA Learning Gains				57			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42					
Math Achievement*	61	56	59	61	50	50	55		
Math Learning Gains				67			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52					
Science Achievement*	51	50	54	49	59	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	45	59	59	30			42		

\* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	282
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

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	410
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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	62			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	51			

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	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	63			

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	43			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	52			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	59			61			51					45
SWD	26			55			29				4	
ELL	53			56							3	45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46			43			27				4	
HSP	64			58			64				3	
MUL	53			76							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			68			63				4	
FRL	55			53			41				5	47

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	52	57	42	61	67	52	49					30
SWD	29	44	33	38	58	42	18					
ELL	47	62		53	77							30
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	56		44	63		30					
HSP	44	65		68	76							
MUL	36			50								
PAC												
WHT	63	58	25	65	69	50	67					
FRL	50	57	39	60	66	50	44					

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	48	63		55	42		48					42
SWD	22	54		39	38		55					
ELL	50			50								42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			40								
HSP	34			50								
MUL	50			60								
PAC												
WHT	56	77		60	69		55					
FRL	44	64		51	38		46					45

**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	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	46%	15%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	83%	55%	28%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	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.**

-Last year, 5th grade math proficiency declined. This can be contributed to new curriculum, increased class size, and loss of an instructional unit in a Math class.

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

Kindergarten to First Grade, based on the ELA STAR assessment, showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Additionally, there was a substantial drop in i-Ready Math from Kindergarten to First grade.

Based on the data, there was a need for an increase in rigorous instruction, differentiation of curriculum, and the need for building teacher capacity in all content areas.

**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.**

Our data shows that we outperformed the state in all Data components.  
 ELA 3rd School 60% State 46%  
 ELA 4th School 60% State 54%  
 ELA 5th School 57% State 53%

Math 3rd School 83% State 47%  
Math 4th 63% State 49%  
5th Math 42% 40%

However, our Students With Disabilities, English Language Learners, and African American students did not meet the state average ELA and Math.

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

The most improved data component was in our 3rd Grade Math (83% proficiency) The action steps that contributed to this was grade level collaborative planning, aggressive progress monitoring, small group support with differentiation for all students across the grade level.

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

Students that stayed a level 1 or showed limited growth in both Math and Reading.  
65% of 4th Grade and 37 of 5th Grade ELA students stayed in Level 1 from PM1 to PM3  
50% of 5th Grade students stayed in Level 1 from PM 1 to PM3

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

- 1-Increase tier 1 instruction across all grade levels.
- 2-Identification of small group needs based on data analysis and strategies implemented with fidelity.
- 3-Aggressive monitoring of student performance during instruction.

**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 Small Group Instruction**

**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.

From 2023 FAST ELA data, there is a need to increase instruction and responsiveness to increase proficiency. This can be achieved through structured collaborative planning with a focus on understanding the depth of the grade level benchmarks and differentiated instruction for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Using the new STAR and FAST assessment data, we will increase students proficiency to 70% on (PM3). Progress will be monitored in small group on a monthly basis to ensure student progress trending to 70% proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration will participate in grade level collaborative planning on a weekly basis and will conduct fidelity walk throughs to ensure small group instruction is occurring and teachers are using the strategies developed in planning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sabrina Tshiamalenge (sabrina.tshiamalenge@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 and purposeful planning for small group instruction across all grade levels.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows data driven instruction allows teachers and students to target specific needs and utilize strategies which increase student academic ownership. From data disaggregation, teachers can implement small group instruction, spiral review, and reteach for students to master ELA benchmarks. Students will set personal goals aligned with their individual ELA data. (Driven by Data)

**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.

Literacy Leadership Collaborative planning Teacher team (mentoring)-Leadership Team

**Person Responsible:** Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)

**By When:** Starting August 21, 2023



Monthly Staff PD-By Staff

Professional Learning Book Study Quarterly PD-Admin

**Person Responsible:** Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)

**By When:** Starting September 2023

Data Analysis

Assessment Data Analysis / Student goal setting-Teachers

Weekly Data Wall Review/Updates-Teachers and Administration

Quarterly Academic Reviews-Admin

**Person Responsible:** Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)

**By When:** Starting September 2023

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

90% of our students will participate in our out monthly schoolwide positive behavior celebrations

**Monitoring:**

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

Our school PBIS team will monitoring behavior "points" on a bi weekly basis and provide a total count of students participating in our behavior celebrations.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sabrina Tshiamalenge (sabrina.tshiamalenge@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.)

Implementation of school wide PBIS program with fidelity monitoring.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS improves social, emotional, and academic outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities and students from underrepresented groups<sup>1</sup>. PBIS is a way to create positive, predictable, equitable and safe learning environments where everyone thrives<sup>3</sup>. By implementing evidence-based practices within a PBIS framework, schools support their students' academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success.

**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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**

**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.

Using FAST PM 3 Data, our overall ELA proficiency was 61% and our overall Math proficiency was 62%. We noticed a trend related to our students with disabilities where in ELA 48% stayed a Level 1 and in Math 53% stayed a Level 1 from PM 1 to PM 3. This shows a need for an increase in Tier 1 instruction to include collaborative planning, scaffolding, differentiation, and standards aligned tasks.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Using FAST PM 3 data, 70% of our students will reach proficiency and 70% of our Students with disabilities will show growth from PM 1 to PM 3.

**Monitoring:**

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

In class progress monitoring will be used on a monthly basis to ensure students are trending in this direction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sabrina Tshiamalenge (sabrina.tshiamalenge@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.)

**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).

School leadership team will review data for students falling in the RAISE category (current 2nd grade Reading students).

Funding will be reviewed by SAC and Leadership on a monthly basis.

## 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

According to I2023 Star data, 50% of students in Grade 1 scored below the 40th percentile. Using I Ready data, 30 % of students in 1st grade showed "On or Above Level"  
All other grades showed higher than 50% proficiency.

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

N/A

### 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

According to 2023 STAR data, 50% of 1st grade students did not meet the 40th percentile. This year, 70% of the current 1st grade students and 70 percent of the current 2nd grade students will meet proficiency as measured by STAR PM 3.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

## 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.

Students will be progressed monitored using PM 1 and PM2 in additional to I Ready PM 1 and PM 2 and Diebels scores to ensure they are trending to meet proficiency.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tshiamalenge, Sabrina, [sabrina.tshiamalenge@hcps.net](mailto:sabrina.tshiamalenge@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?

Teachers will improve Tier 1 instruction by implementing standards aligned task, differentiation, and scaffolding

### 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?

Collaborative planning will increase the implementation of standards aligned tasks which will ensure improved rigor for students while scaffolding and differentiation will assist students who need additional support.

**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
Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning with Administration and academic interventionist.	Tshiamalenge, Sabrina, sabrina.tshiamalenge@hcps.net
Teachers will participate in monthly professional development determined by administration walk through trends.	Tshiamalenge, Sabrina, sabrina.tshiamalenge@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 plan will be posted on our school website. In addition, the plan is reviewed by our SAC team at the beginning of the year and periodically throughout the year. Leadership team will also refer to SIP during ILT meetings.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We encourage parents to attend and be a part of our school events by sending home flyers, parent links, phone calls and posting to our website and social media. We focus on communicating every child's progress by engaging parents and parent teacher conferences and sending home quarterly progress notes.

School staff , students, parents and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success.

We value building positive relationships with families. Events that parents are invited to include:

Quarterly Report card celebrations, grade level showcase, curriculum nights, and parent- teacher conferences.

**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)**

High level Tier 1 instruction is the pathway for academic success in all grade level. This is accomplished with collaborative planning that focuses on standards and ensuring standard aligned tasks in the classroom. Our school improvement plan will provide teachers the opportunities to grow professionally with monthly and quarterly Professional development, have in depth discussions about data and have time to collaboratively plan with grade level teams and administration to ensure this high level of Tier 1 instruction and having a proactive plan for small groups and differentiation.

**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