Claywell Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Claywell Elementary School

4500 NORTHDALE BLVD, 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.

Claywell Elementary will provide a collaborative, nurturing environment that empowers all individuals to be productive and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Claywell Elementary students will become respectful citizens and lifelong learners.

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
Jones, Robert	Principal	The leadership Team meets regularly. The purpose of this core is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the MTSS process at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at all levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of goals in curriculum, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. The principal is the instructional leader of the school and maintains the facility.
Dunlap, Diane	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is an instructional leader emphasizing curriculum. She is the school's testing coordinator and program developer. She assists the principal in maintaining the school's high expectations for all.
Stockslager, Lauren	School Counselor	The guidance counselor is a support. She addresses CST, MTSS, and 504 plans. She holds guidance lessons, small group and individual counseling along with peer mediation/conflict resolution. She oversees the mentoring program.
Collins, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	TTD - Planning, PD, and assisting teachers with instructional practices.
Wild, Kelli	Attendance/ Social Work	The social worker monitor attendance. She coordinates the school-wide behavior and attendance incentive programs. She assists the guidance counselor aabd psychologist as a support.
Giesking, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	TTD- Planning, PD, and assisting teachers with instructional practices.

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.

Teachers attend weekly morning planning sessions with TTD's for instructional practice support. They also hold morning class meetings to promote a sense of family and build a positive school culture. These meetings also address a positive mental mindset. In addition, they attend weekly PLC's to collaborate and analyze data.
Guidance holds weekly grade level guidance lessons as well as small group and individual counseling. Mindful mornings will focus on mental health. While grade levels are collaboratively planning in the mornings, support staff will meet with those grade level students.

Our Social Worker organizes the school-wide behavior incentive system. Students are identified by character development traits monthly. These traits are highlighted during the year. Students are awarded incentives for positive expectations. Monthly celebrations are followed throughout the year.
Leadership, MTSS, CST, and Steering meetings provide support for students. TTD provides support for teachers. SAC addressed the school's focus and strategies for improvement.
PTA assists with our culture. They provide additional resources and learning opportunities for our students.
We collaborate with universities to have interns on campus. This has helped us obtain excellent teachers.

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))

A schedule of collaborative planning sessions with TTD's, as well as PLC's, will be maintained and outcomes reported weekly. Administration will conduct walk-throughs to observe the goals and implementation in action. Results will be discussed in leadership meetings, as well as with the teachers. Students will be administered the progress monitoring assessments in the PM1 and PM2 windows, as well as the Iready assessments. to monitor progress and make adjustments to instruction based on students' needs. Data will be reviewed, analyzed, and discussed by grade levels and the ILT (Instructional Leadership Team) to provide an outlook on trends and school/student needs. We will provide support through an ELP teacher, small group strategies, and computer program support tools.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

	2019-20: C
*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2018-19: C
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	

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	2	22	24	23	17	27	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	7
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	12	19	29	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	30	19	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	6	5	2	9	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	0	4	3	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	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	4
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	22	24	23	17	27	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	7
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	12	19	29	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	30	19	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	6	5	2	9	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	4
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	59	53	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				55			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			25		
Math Achievement*	58	56	59	64	50	50	51		
Math Learning Gains				70			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			38		
Science Achievement*	51	50	54	49	59	59	50		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	83	59	59	91			77		

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	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	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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	59			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	65			

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%
FRL	53			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	61			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	57			

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			58			51					83
SWD	30			34			28				5	70
ELL	53			72			50				4	82
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			38							3	
HSP	57			57			42				5	81
MUL	43			52							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	70			65			65				4	
FRL	48			51			37				5	88

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	59	55	41	64	70	59	49					91
SWD	22	37	40	35	46	45	14					80
ELL	46	47	47	62	75	86	40					91
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	68	54		50	67							
HSP	51	52	40	63	73	72	47					90
MUL	58	58		53	67							
PAC												
WHT	71	64	40	72	72		59					
FRL	47	48	37	57	69	62	41					93

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	59	47	25	51	42	38	50					77
SWD	28	23	13	25	43	47	20					71
ELL	47	43		47	48		45					77
AMI												
ASN	60			50								
BLK	50	36		25	15		23					
HSP	55	46	31	47	46	43	44					79
MUL	56			56								
PAC												
WHT	68	53		65	50		69					
FRL	51	44	26	41	39	35	39					75

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	49%	53%	-4%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	54%	23%	58%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	46%	0%	50%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	55%	-5%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	53%	-6%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	51%	-7%

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.

5th grade science was the lowest performance, with 46% proficiency. Instruction was not aligned with the academic calendar, resulting in some standards not getting covered in time for the assessment. In addition, students need more support in scientific vocabulary proficiency to better comprehend the questions on the assessment.

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

Math achievement showed a decline from 64% to 58%, from 2022 to 2023 data. This area has been a strong area in the past, so the focus was greatly placed on ELA, as well as the understanding of the new BEST standards. The focus on implementation and math support strategies became a challenge, especially if they fell behind on the academic calendar.

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.

5th grade Science was 44% proficient compared to the state average of 50%. Science proficiency has been stagnant over the years and is an area of struggle to improve growth. There is much required reading in the science assessment, as well as content knowledge and vocabulary. We need to bridge the gap through reading strategies and science vocabulary to improve scores.

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

ELA proficiency stayed about the same from 59% in 2022, to 57% in 2023. Although this does not show an improvement, maintaining this proficiency is a gain from previous years. There was a strong focus on unpacking the BEST standards, scaffolding comprehension strategies, and tracking and analyzing student data; developing lesson plans based on student progression and needs. Meeting with the TTD to develop data driven lessons and assessments that were BEST standards aligned.

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

Based on the EWS data, the area of concern is the attendance for the level 1 students. There is a large number of absences affiliated with the students that have the highest need in closing achievement gaps.

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

Bridging grade level gaps through small group instruction and support, cross curricula.
Increase and implement academic vocabulary and engagement in students.
Provide professional development and collaborative PLC's to increase teacher's toolbox and support for meeting the needs of all students.

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 Other

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.

Student engagement is essential to promote a positive culture and environment that promotes student learning. Learning activities must be aligned to the standards and include student participation. Explicit teaching strategies for all students is the key. Last year, we focused on student discussion including within small remediation groups. This year we will continue the discussion strategy as well as differentiation and learning styles. In addition, several staff members held weekly math lunch bunch groups, QMT review days, and instructional support materials such as IXL for intermediate grade levels.

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

Maintain high level academic student engagement through discussion, differentiation, and learning style teaching strategies as measured by increased student achievement through progress monitoring assessments from Fall 2023 to Spring 2024. Last year's proficiency PM3 scores were 57% for math and 58% for ELA. Focused student engagement will result in grades 3-5 proficiency levels rising to 70% by Spring 2024.

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

The Progress Monitoring Assessment is given three times per year: PMA 1 (August-September), PMA 2 (December-January), and PMA 3 (May). These assessments will be monitored by the school's Leadership Team. Data will be reviewed through grade level collaborative planning with TTD, and grade level PLC's.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Jones (robert.jones@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.)

One single strategy may not always work. We will follow three specific strategies. Student discussion increases student engagement. Students orally elaborate their thoughts, justify their thinking, and ask one another about their thinking. Differentiation as a planned response to intervention increases student engagement. Students are met where they are and scaffolded to where they need to be. Relating content to student learning styles will increase student engagement as students have the opportunity for visual, auditory, and kinesthetic classroom experiences.

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

John Hattie's visible learning research uses .40 as a hinge point of effectiveness. Student engagement by itself is .56 on the scale. Adding discussion (.82), differentiation (1.29) and explicit teaching strategies (.57) within instructional practices leads to an even higher effect size.

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.

To address ESSA subgroup - Students with Disabilities
ESE case managers communicate IEP goals and accommodations to all classroom teachers in August.

Person Responsible: Diane Dunlap (diane.dunlap@hcps.net)

By When: Update Monthly

Planning for engagement through strategies: Weekly collaborative planning sessions with TTD. Weekly grade level PLC's.

Person Responsible: Brittany Collins (brittany.collins@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

Leadership conducts bi-monthly school walkthroughs to track student engagement including students with disabilities. Monitor progress at Leadership meetings. Provide feedback on instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

ESE/ELL Support.
Provide resources to classroom teachers.

Person Responsible: Diane Dunlap (diane.dunlap@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly through May 2024

Support Staff - Focus on removing educational barriers to improve student success.
Poor attendance - Social Worker
Mental Health - Classroom, small group, and individual counseling - Guidance Counselor

Person Responsible: Lauren Stockslager (lauren.stockslager@hcps.net)

By When: As needed through May 2024

Parent/Family Engagement
Literacy Night
SMATH Night
Hispanic Heritage Night

Person Responsible: Diane Dunlap (diane.dunlap@hcps.net)

By When: Quarterly through April 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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.

Progress monitoring during grade level PLC's have been ongoing the past few years. Procedures continue to be frequently updated. Data discussions focused on assessment results. After viewing data, student differentiation needs to be better monitored. Last year grade levels determined their weekly meetings. They were not always held with fidelity. This year, collaborative grade level meetings are scheduled and facilitated by our TTD. Consistent grade level collaborative planning will aid in targeting instructional strategies to meet student needs.

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

By December 2023, at least 65% of all K-5 teachers and by May 2024, at least 90% of all teachers will implement standards- aligned lessons developed during weekly collaborative planning sessions as measured by the school created walkthrough form. This will result in increasing proficiency to 70% as measured by the progress monitoring assessment in Spring 2024.

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

A schedule of collaborative planning sessions will be maintained, and outcomes reported weekly by TTD. Conduct bi-monthly administrative walkthroughs recording observations on the school walkthrough form. Results will be discussed during Leadership meetings and shared with school staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Jones (robert.jones@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.)

Progress monitoring students during lessons enables teachers to adjust their instruction. Giving teachers the opportunity to plan together and adjust their instructional practices enables students to greater achievement. By including students, this will help build buy-in support.

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

John Hattie's visible learning research uses .40 as the hinge point of effectiveness. The areas of Evaluation and reflection (.75) on the scale, with feedback as (.70), are well above the hinge point leading to greater effectiveness.

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.

Hold grade level weekly collaborative planning sessions.
Maintain schedules, agenda, and outcome reports.
Discuss differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Brittany Collins (brittany.collins@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

Monitor progress during weekly grade level PLC's. Team Leaders outcome report. Maintain and update data walls.
Compare progress monitoring assessments.
Leadership Team reviews data.

Person Responsible: Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

By When: As needed through May 2024

Follow aggressive monitoring techniques during class instruction.
Posted class rubrics for student evaluation.
Students set academic goals and track progress with classroom teacher.
Apply technology applications during instruction.

Person Responsible: Diane Dunlap (diane.dunlap@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

Leadership completes bi-monthly school walkthrough form to track instructional practices. Leadership team reviews data.
Provide feedback on instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Robert Jones (robert.jones@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly through May 2024

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).

The leadership team meets to discuss the needs of the school and how to support teachers, after obtaining teacher feedback. Then the leadership team votes and approves items within the budget, such as books for book study PD, manipulatives for classrooms, and additional programs to support teaching and students, such as IXL and Magnetic Reading.

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 at this time.

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

Based on the 2023 ELA FAST scores, 57% in grades 3-5 scored proficiency, with a 3 or higher. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include teacher and student clarity of the standards-aligned to instruction, student discussion, implementation of vocabulary, comprehension, and performance assessment tasks resulting in 70% student proficiency on the end of year ELA FAST assessment, PM3.

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 at this time.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of grades 3-5 students scoring as proficient or higher on the PM3 ELA assessment will increase to 70% as measured by PM3 monitoring assessments.

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.

The strategy effectiveness will be measured through the grade 3-5 PM3 assessments. They will also be monitored throughout the school year by teacher observations, specific teaching strategies, and data collection. Administrative walk-throughs will include checking for these strategies. Data will be collected and entered on the grade level data walls, as well as the data charts used for analyzing and discussing student progress.

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

Jones, Robert, robert.jones@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?

Increase student engagement through quality student discussion. Students elaborate their thoughts, justify their thinking, while sharing with their peers. Provide opportunities for students to ask and answer questions to better understand text they read. Build student's word knowledge to make sense of text. Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read. Teachers monitor and assess during and after their instruction to plan for needed differentiation. Instruction is aligned to the BEST standards.

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?

The evidence-based practices will address student needs. They have a proven record of effectiveness. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning research, discussion has an effectiveness scale score of .82 where .40 is the hinge point. According to WWC (What Works Clearing House), the practices of vocabulary and comprehension provide strong evidence for literacy success.

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
Planning for engagement through strategies. Weekly collaborative planning sessions with TTD's. Weekly grade level PLC's.	Jones, Robert, robert.jones@hcps.net
Teachers model and implement the vocabulary and comprehension strategies in their instruction. Leadership conducts bi-monthly walk-throughs to track student engagement strategies.	Jones, Robert, robert.jones@hcps.net