Colson Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Colson Elementary School

1520 LAKEVIEW AVE, Seffner, FL 33584

[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 be the culture builders so that students can be problem-solvers, respectful, involved, dependable, and encouraging.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To support students so that they can, and they will.

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
Black, Rebecca	Principal	
Woodfork, Lakisha	Assistant Principal	
Long, Deborah	SAC Member	
Bonin, Jessica	Reading Coach	
Mariney, Dorilin	Math Coach	
Fowler, Samantha	Other	
Jepson Rodgers, Alexandra	School Counselor	
Robrahn, Celeste	Attendance/Social Work	

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.

The School Advisory Council met in the Spring of 2023 to review the goals from the previous year, and the progress we had made towards them. Input was gathered from staff members, parents, business partners, and community members. In August 2023, the School Advisory Council met to collaborate on the SIP goals for this school year, and how they would be monitored by school staff.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation through classroom walkthroughs by leadership, assessment data, and meeting with stakeholders involved. After looking at data from walkthroughs and assessments, the leadership team and SAC will revise the plan if needed, using data to drive the decision making.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	5	40	21	26	30	33	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	4	10	13	0	0	0	36
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	41	33	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	40	35	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	30	28	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	35	33	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	21	24	22	20	28	26	0	0	0	141

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	3	1	2	26	22	0	0	0	54

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	6	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	19
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	1	41	20	33	32	24	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	11	2	0	0	0	21
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	42	22	28	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	43	22	35	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	12	20	29	14	21	0	0	0	107

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	2	7	17	1	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	17
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	1	41	20	33	32	24	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	11	2	0	0	0	21
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	42	22	28	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	43	22	35	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	12	20	29	14	21	0	0	0	107

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	2	7	17	1	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	17
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*	42	50	53	43	53	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				56			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			38		
Math Achievement*	46	56	59	50	50	50	35		
Math Learning Gains				70			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			23		
Science Achievement*	45	50	54	34	59	59	28		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	65	59	59	68			62		

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	238
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

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	424
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	17	Yes	4	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	42			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	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%
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	51			

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	42			46			45					65
SWD	15			20			12				4	
ELL	33			40			42				5	65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			37			32				4	
HSP	33			40			44				5	64
MUL	48			41			70				4	
PAC												
WHT	56			55			48				4	
FRL	33			35			36				5	63

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	43	56	54	50	70	49	34					68
SWD	13	44	50	27	50	42	6					
ELL	38	50	54	33	62	57	23					68
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	34	57	62	45	72	44	9					
HSP	38	53	48	44	68	47	39					68
MUL	54	53		58	65							
PAC												
WHT	50	64		57	70	62	42					
FRL	36	54	52	46	68	50	30					68

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	42	39	38	35	33	23	28					62
SWD	15	13	10	12	5	0	10					70
ELL	32	44		36	31		13					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	50		30	35		13					
HSP	37	39		32	24		27					65
MUL	54			50								
PAC												
WHT	48	29		39	39		33					
FRL	38	38	36	32	29	24	21					62

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	42%	53%	-11%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	54%	0%	58%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	46%	-8%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	61%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	47%	-2%	51%	-6%

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.

3rd grade ELA showed the lowest performance last year, with 38% of students scoring a 3 or higher compared to the state average of 50%. Contributing factors were students' lack of foundational skills as they entered third grade.

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

While there was not a decline, our math proficiency data stayed the same at 50% proficiency. Factors that contributed to this decline were filling in gaps for students due to the new benchmarks and developing targeted interventions to support student understanding.

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.

The greatest gap was in our ELA proficiency compared to the state. Colson is at 46% proficiency, 8% points less than the state. This is again showing the need to focus on foundational reading skills in the primary grades.

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

Our Science data went up 11% from the previous year, with 45% of our 5th grade students being proficient. We implemented weekly planning sessions, with monthly data chats to discuss student progress and which standards students needed more support on.

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

Our potential areas of concern are attendance and the number of students with a substantial reading proficiency.

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

K-5 reading instruction
K-5 math instruction
K-5 science instruction
Sub-groups gains across content areas
Student attendance

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 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.

We have focused our efforts in reading and math to make improvements with our students. We have academic coaches in Math and Literacy that support teachers in developing rigorous instruction in these areas. We have
built in time to have collaborative planning once a week to support teachers in standards-based instruction.

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

The percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient on the FAST assessment will increase to 51% in ELA, 55% in Math and 50% on the 5th grade SSA.

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

-Weekly collaborative planning sessions led by the literacy and math coach.
-Science teachers will meet for bi-weekly planning sessions
-Regular feedback from administrators and coaches
-Learning Walks
-Modeling through side-by-side coaching and job-embedded professional development

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@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.)

• Classroom Discussion- Hattie effect size .82- Teachers should embed many times within a lesson that allows for student-to-student discussion around a topic/skill.
• Feedback- Hattie effect size .70- Teachers should be very clear with students on how they "measure up" before, during, and after learning (performance scales) and if they are below expectation, provide students with how they can move towards on level achievement.

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

* Classroom Discussion- students need the opportunity to learn from their peers in order to reinforce or push their own thinking and learning.
* Feedback- students should have an understanding of the goal, their current level, and how to achieve their goal

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Our highest priorities are to continue to strive for proficiency in reading and math. Students with disabilities has been our lowest subgroup for proficiency.

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

If teachers utilize targeted small-group instruction in ELA, math, and science, then bottom quartile and subgroups identified by the Federal Index below 41% will have learning gains increased by at least 5% in each
area using the following target indicators; Students with Disabilities in ELA 17% to 22%, Math 31% to 36%.

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

-The Assistant Principal will work with Title 1 Aides to help support students in small group
-ESE Specialist will meet with VE teachers weekly for additional planning sessions on UDL.
-ESE Specialist will meet with ESE aides once a month to model interventions and classroom support.
-Grade level data chats led by team leads to monitor student progress.
-Math & Reading coach will model interventions to staff
-Monitoring fidelity of reading and math interventions

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@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.)

Differentiation and small-group instruction.

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

In the journal article, "Differentiated Instruction: A Research Basis", current evidence supports addressing student differences through meeting a variety of learning styles and multiple intelligences. To provide these varied modalities, we need access to personnel, technology, and instructional materials. Implementing differentiated instruction will raise students' confidence and motivation levels by providing curriculum rich with
embedded growth mindset. Our area of focus levels the playing field for our lowest 25% through a variety of modalities/learning styles, remediation, and enrichment opportunities.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

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

Due to the circumstances of disease control in 2020, student attendance has been significantly impacted. When students are not in school, they are missing crucial instruction. Attendance can be impacted by lack of parental involvement, and commitment to their student's education.

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

We will increase the Colson average daily attendance rate from 91% to 95%.

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

The social worker will review with staff the MTSS for attendance protocol, and check in with staff on the implementation of proper absence reporting procedures. At our bi-weekly student services team meetings, we will review attendance data and determine which students need support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Family engagement and support

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

In the article, "Fifteen Effective Strategies for Improving Student Attendance and Truancy Prevention" by Jay Smink, D.Ed. and Mary S. Reimer, Ph.D., research consistently finds that family engagement has a direct, positive effect on children's achievement

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).

To support student learning we have used funding to have three Title 1 Aides on campus to pull students in small group for differentiated instruction. We have also used funds to purchase additional supplemental material for reading and math to be used in small group instruction by teachers and aides.

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

Based on Spring 2023 STAR PM3 Reading scores, 49% of students in grades Kindergarten-2nd grade scored at proficiency for the end of the year grade level benchmarks. These percentages are indicators of the percentage of students on-track for scoring a level 3 or above on statewide, standardized assessments.

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

Based on the 2023 ELA FAST scores, 45% in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher.
This score was due to students entering a grade already below level which impacted their on grade-level performance and showed a need for acceleration to close the existing achievement gap.

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

The percent of grades K-2 students scoring proficient, will increase to 54% or higher as measured by the Spring 2024 STAR Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of grades 3-5 students scoring proficient, which is a level 3 or higher will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the 2024 ELA FAST assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Students progress in ELA will be progress monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments. This data
will be used to set individualized goals, plan for instruction, and monitor students progress toward proficiency.

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

Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@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?

We will implement a planning structure with ELA grade level teams in grades K-5 that will allow them to internalize the Guiding Question and use it as a basis for backward planning. Within these planning structures, we will incorporate structures and strategies that encourage student discussion, students taking
ownership of their work, and active engagement during the ELA block.

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?

In 2023, the data showed an increase from 43% to 45% of 3-5 students making proficiency on the FAST ELA
assessment. The improvement strategy of providing standard-based planning structures focuses core instruction on developing rigorous and meaningful ELA lessons that are purposeful and engage students in
critical thinking and reading strategies that will increase reading proficiency.

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
Provide a school wide professional development that teaches teachers how to use student discussion and differentiated small-groups. Administration will set the expectation that student discourse will be identified, taught, posted, and utilized in every classroom. Opportunities for professional development will be designed for each grade level and also embedded into planning sessions.	Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@hcps.net
The reading coach will facilitate planning sessions while incorporating prompting questions that illicit teacher discussion and plans that meet consistent expectations of high quality student discourse.	Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@hcps.net
Conduct walkthrough to collect evidence for look-fors and student talk. Provide feedback to teachers based on observations.	Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@hcps.net
Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the Guiding Unit question and focus standards. The framework will include the following steps: · Teachers pre-read all texts and tasks provided within the instructional guide. · Literacy Coach will communicate prior to planning what texts/task teachers will be planning with during the session. · Teachers internalize the task by "doing the work" and discussing at planning what knowledge and skills the students will need to have to complete it successfully. · Based on the internalizing work, teachers will then construct daily learning targets that will contain both the skill and strategy needed for the day. · Literacy Coach will guide teachers in creating anchor charts they can use and refer to throughout the week to support instruction and student understanding. · Construct rigorous student tasks aligned to this guiding question and learning target	Black, Rebecca, rebecca.black@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 school improvement plan is shared with stakeholders at Colson's Annual Title 1 meeting in both English and Spanish, as well as at our first SAC Meeting. It is shared with staff members during preplanning. It is available on online and in print through the front office.

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))

Colson communicates with families through a weekly Sunday message in both English and Spanish that is a phone call, email, and text. We send families a monthly calendar of upcoming events, and have our events shared on our webpage and school Dojo. Parent engagement events are planned monthly, with flyers and surveys sent out to help us ensure we are meeting the needs of our families.

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))

If teachers utilize targeted small group instruction in ELA, Math and Science then proficiency in ELA will go up to 51%, math 55% and science 50%, increasing 5% in each area based on the Florida State Assessments in 2024. Resource teachers in reading and math will consistently plan with teachers and model in the classroom to support instruction. Our Title 1 Aides will work with the resource teachers to plan out small group instruction with students identified in an underperforming group, and monitor student progress through our assessment plan.

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))

Colson's school improvement plan is developed in coordination and integration with state guidelines, Hillsborough County supported materials and instructional guides and assessments in alignment with benchmarks outlined in the BEST standards.