

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Dowdell Middle Magnet School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Dowdell Middle Magnet School

1208 WISHING WELL WAY, Tampa, FL 33619

[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.

To provide a secure and diverse learning community through equitable instruction where all students achieve academically.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dowdell Middle Magnet will foster an environment that encourages students to maximize their potential while being accountable and trustworthy to themselves, the school, the environment, and each other.

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
Schlarbaum, Stacey	Principal	
Johnson, Nikole	Reading Coach	SAC Chair
Makovec, Timothy	Teacher, K-12	HCTA Rep & Magnet Representative
Matthison, Timothy	Assistant Principal	
DeDecker, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Math SAL
Perez, Season	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Guidance & Advocacy
Fields, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies SAL

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.

Parents and students were given information on joining the SAC committee at open house. Families were given the recruitment letter and a list of the SAC meeting dates for the school year. They were asked at the meetings for their input on improving our literacy scores and helping our students become better readers.

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 SAC committee will meet monthly to look at student data and how we are meeting the needs of our students. To encourage parental involvement, when we have conference night, the SAC meetings are scheduled to coincide with those dates.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	0	0	0	0	0	46	62	79	187	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	52	64	128	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	12	25	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	76	0	178	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	67	0	132	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	8	26	

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	0	0	35	66	74	175

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	2	3	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	38	67	88	193	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	51	84	190	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	68	91	222	
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	0	0	7	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	10

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	0	0	0	0	0	38	67	88	193	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	51	84	190	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	68	91	222	
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	0	0	7	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	6	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	10	

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*	32	49	49	36	50	50	31		
ELA Learning Gains				44			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			35		
Math Achievement*	40	57	56	31	36	36	24		
Math Learning Gains				49			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			31		
Science Achievement*	19	44	49	27	52	53	28		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	66	68	66	58	58	40		
Middle School Acceleration	84	84	73	75	51	49	75		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	50	39	40	45	86	76	21		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	16	Yes	4	4
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	49			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	1	
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	29	Yes	3	3
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	32			40			19	62	84			50
SWD	12			20			4	27			4	
ELL	22			29			8	56			5	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			32			21	51	91		5	
HSP	35			42			20	63	83		6	50
MUL	50			61							2	
PAC												
WHT	25			40			18	78			4	
FRL	31			37			19	61	81		5	

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	36	44	39	31	49	61	27	66	75			45
SWD	17	31	27	17	46	57	8					
ELL	28	43	47	28	49	49	22	58	69			45
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	31	47	38	22	42	65	22	57	71			
HSP	38	45	42	35	54	59	27	67	76			48
MUL	40	38		20	43							
PAC												
WHT	35	39	33	33	45	60	36	71				
FRL	35	44	39	30	49	60	26	65	76			42

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	31	35	35	24	29	31	28	40	75			21
SWD	13	30	23	9	28	30	19	31				
ELL	19	31	31	15	28	45	3	33				21
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	35	34	18	27	23	14	37				
HSP	29	36	33	25	29	38	26	39	71			22
MUL	50	29		42	28		60					
PAC												
WHT	38	34	37	26	27	29	52	41	81			
FRL	29	35	35	23	29	30	27	39	77			17

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
07	2023 - Spring	36%	47%	-11%	47%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	21%	44%	-23%	47%	-26%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	26%	47%	-21%	47%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	28%	36%	-8%	48%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	57%	-18%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	15%	41%	-26%	44%	-29%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	55%	34%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	64%	-8%	66%	-10%

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.

Preliminary data indicates that the lowest component was science. Factors that may have contributed to the low performance include vacancies and the reading level of students.

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

Science and literacy had the greatest decline in scores compared to previous years.

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.

Science had the greatest gap compared to the state average.

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

Math had the most improvement, increasing from 31% proficiency in 2022 to 37% proficiency in 2023. Teachers focused on standards-based lesson planning, preparing collaborative lessons, implementing rigorous informational texts with science curriculum, and progress monitoring students' mastery of standards.

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

Low ESE test performance continues to be an area of concern as does literacy levels of all students.

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

1. Standard-aligned planning
2. Differentiation Strategies
3. Literacy 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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

To enhance student learning by implementing rigorous differentiation strategies (scaffolding effect size 0.82) through purposeful standard-aligned planning (teacher clarity effect size 0.75) that fosters collaborative student engagement (collaboration effect size 0.55).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will improve their literacy levels as measured by the FAST test. From 27% to 40% at a level 3 or above.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by using the FAST PM 1 & 2 to measure student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@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 differentiation strategies (scaffolding effect size 0.82), gradual release of explicit instruction (direct instruction effect size .50), and small groups (interventions for students with learning needs effect size 0.77) during planning for instruction to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We focused on strategies that will most help our ESE students based on Hattie's effect size research and the needs of our ESE students. With our resources available, within class scaffolding and explicit instruction is our first line of support with Small group interventions for literacy to support student 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.

Student Baseline writing test & Progress Monitoring 1 for FAST ELA test administered.

Person Responsible: Nikole Johnson (nikole.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Students in intensive reading classes baseline tested through Language Live.

Person Responsible: Nikole Johnson (nikole.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Data Analysis of PM1 Data & Writing data complete so that the data can be used with teachers for instructional planning & small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Nikole Johnson (nikole.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

To promote pride in our school through accountability & ownership of our TEAM values (trust, equity, accountability, maximize).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through TEAM values we have established trust among teachers and staff. We will continue that through monthly celebrations and teacher and staff recognition. Our goal is to retain 80% of our instructional staff.

Monitoring:

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

We will provide instructional and behavioral support for teachers, increasing teacher and student success. We will monitor through walkthroughs and teacher attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@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 intervene through behavioral and academic support. Behaviorally, our PBIS system celebrates positive student behaviors in the classroom, and we will provide ongoing PD for teachers on instructional and behavioral management. Academic coaches and subject area leaders will provide academic supports to teachers to increase confidence and teacher success. RTI & success coach will provide additional behavioral support to teachers to increase positive student behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers who are knowledgeable and have positive relationships with students experience more success in the classroom and are more likely to be retained and complete the school year.

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.

During preplanning teachers received PD on champs & PBIS which supported classroom management, positive behavior interventions and celebrations.

Person Responsible: Kristin Sabina (kristi.sabina@hcps.net)

By When: August 28, 2023

PD & support for teachers provided on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible: Kristin Sabina (kristi.sabina@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

We will focus on differentiation strategies, gradual release of explicit instruction, and small groups during planning for instruction to increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will increase their achievement on the FAST PM testing. We hope to achieve a 10% increase in students on-level performance from PM1 to PM3 this year for students with disabilities and multi-racial ESSA subgroups.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Progress Monitoring Data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Schlarbaum (stacey.schlarbaum@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.)

Targeted Small Group Instruction

Explicit, direct instruction of foundational reading skills within intensive reading classes

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted small group instruction allows us to address gaps in students' learning.

Direct, explicit instruction of foundational reading skills follows research on the science of reading for adolescent learners.

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.

Student Baseline writing test & Progress Monitoring 1 for FAST ELA test administered.

Person Responsible: Nikole Johnson (nikole.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Students in intensive reading classes baseline tested through Language Live.

Person Responsible: Nikole Johnson (nikole.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Data Analysis of PM1 Data & Writing data complete so that the data can be used with teachers for instructional planning & small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Nikole Johnson (nikole.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

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)).

Title 1 funds were used to fund Student Success coach and an RTI lead to support student achievement and increase time on task and in class.

This was decided with the leadership team based on discipline data and attendance of all students but especially students with disabilities and multi-racial students.

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.

Parents were invited to participate in the school advisory committee (SAC) during open house and through our school website. Information is provided in multiple languages and the dates of all meetings are posted on the school website, inviting parents to attend & participate. We are intentionally hold 4 of the meetings during the school year in the evenings during our conference nights to engage more of our parents and make it easier for them to attend. The remainder of the meetings are during the school day to allow everyone a chance to participate. School Website: <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/domain/5774>

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 have an annual title I meeting, we have SAC montly meetings, we also have an active PTSA. The principal sends weekly parentlinks (emails & texts) to make sure parents are aware of important school events, opportunities for involvement, and academic progress reports and conference nights. Our parent involvement plan is on the school Website: <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/domain/5774> The SAC

meetings and contact information is also on the school website: <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/site/default.aspx?PageType=3&ModuleInstanceID=23260&ViewID=7b97f7ed-8e5e-4120-848f-a8b4987d588f&RenderLoc=0&FlexDataID=77071&PageID=9581>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our Area of Focus is to enhance student learning by implementing rigorous differentiation strategies (scaffolding effect size 0.82) through purposeful standard-aligned planning (teacher clarity effect size 0.75) that fosters collaborative student engagement (collaboration effect size 0.55). We have provided teacher PD in effective learning targets, guided release with explicit instruction, and differentiation strategies to help support the academic quality. We have also increased the amount of learning time by implementing breakfast in the classroom which adds an additional 15 minutes of class time for students as they arrive to school.

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))

We are a CEP (community eligibility provision) school which allows all students to receive free breakfast and lunch to support student nutrition and learning. We also have a partnership with boys and girls club to provide after school programming, and we have an onsite ENVO counselor to provide mental health services for students.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$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