Lockhart Elementary Magnet School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lockhart Elementary Magnet School

3719 N 17TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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.

Provide Rigorous Instruction for Disciplined Excellence

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare students to be critical thinkers, problem solvers, and responsible members of society

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
Jackson, Corey	Principal	
Bell, Shalanda	Assistant Principal	
Shanteloo, Jasmine	Math Coach	
McGregor, Megan	Magnet Coordinator	
	Instructional Coach	

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 stakeholders were invited to share input during the creating and editing process of the SIP. The SIP draft was a collective effort from all involved. The leadership team ad school staff voted on the verbiage and invited to provide feedback about the goals established in the plan.

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 involve continuous monitoring over the course of the school year with the SLT team and Lockhart stakeholders. The school will strategically calendarize dates to conduct a progress monitor conversation and needs assessment. Students with the greatest achievement gap will be placed on Individualized Success Plan. The plans will include small group instruction, opportunities for ELP (Saturday Instruction, and Intensive Math remediation.
Revisions will always occur per each nine weeks if necessary.

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	95%
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) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 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	0	17	11	18	18	11	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	46	26	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	37	25	1	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	11	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	8	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	42	39	34	0	0	0	115

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	1	20	25	10	0	0	0	56

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	17	14	24	24	22	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	4	10	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	24	18	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	20	23	0	0	0	65
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	1	2	10	4	0	0	0	0	17

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	17	14	24	24	22	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	4	10	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	24	18	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	20	23	0	0	0	65
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	1	2	10	4	0	0	0	0	17

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
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*	26	50	53	32	53	56	32		
ELA Learning Gains				61			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			54		
Math Achievement*	31	56	59	35	50	50	31		
Math Learning Gains				61			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			17		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	19	50	54	28	59	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	59	73			38		

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	24
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	94
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	10	Yes	4	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	1	1
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	35	Yes	1	
FRL	23	Yes	1	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	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	50			

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	26			31			19					
SWD	15			13			4				4	
ELL	36			36							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			30			17				4	
HSP	43			50							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33			42							3	
FRL	25			30			19				4	

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	32	61	61	35	61	57	28					73
SWD	10	50	60	10	39	48	12					
ELL	33			25								73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	57	58	34	59	54	20					
HSP	50			42								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	31	62	61	33	60	58	21					73

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	32	52	54	31	39	17	29					38
SWD	16	25		14	17		10					
ELL	45			18								38

	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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	46	58	27	34	18	17					
HSP	82			45								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	29	50	54	30	42	17	26					38

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	31%	53%	-22%	54%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	54%	-17%	58%	-21%
03	2023 - Spring	17%	46%	-29%	50%	-33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	28%	55%	-27%	59%	-31%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	59%	-5%	61%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	27%	53%	-26%	55%	-28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	19%	47%	-28%	51%	-32%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

-The lowest performing data point for Lockhart was the 22-23 Science Proficiency with a 19%, This was a 9% drop from the previous year.

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

-Our science scores demonstrated the greatest dip in proficiency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

-Our Science component had the greatest gap.

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

-Our math demonstrated the most improvement with a +5-percentage point improvement.

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

-Our ELA level 1 student poses this largest area of concern.

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

1. Improve Academic Achievement in all core subject areas.
2. Improve attendance by 6%.
3. Strengthen teacher capacity through our PLC model.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

Description: Student achievement will increase by establishing an collaborative culture through PLCs to implement and plan high-quality instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards.
Rationale: With the launch of the BEST standards, we want to ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the standards and how to use them to effectively plan student instruction. Additionally, we recently adopted new curriculum. Implementing a system for backwards planning.

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 70% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to be engaged in standards aligned tasks.
By Spring 2024, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities.
for students to be engaged in standards aligned tasks.

As a result, student data will show:
• FAST PM3 data in Reading (Grades 3-5) will show 33% of students performing at or above proficiency.
• FAST PM3 data in Math will show 41% of students performing at or above proficiency.
• SSA data in Science will show 28% of students performing at or above proficiency
Subgroups: SWD, African-American and Hispanic populations scoring below the 41% will receive intensive academic support and behavioral supports via FBA/BIP implementation.

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

This will be monitored through observation and feedback throughout the year.
Coaching Cycles, Classroom Observations with feedback, PLCs, Exit Tickets, and Student Work

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Corey Jackson (corey.jackson@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.)

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will be focused on supporting teachers with understanding of grade level standards and task alignment using common assessments, student work, and data analysis. The work of the PLC will be focused on Dufour's four (4) questions:

1. What do we want all students to know and be able to?
2. How will we know if they learned it?
3. How will we respond when some students do not learn?
4. How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient?

Hattie's effect sizes: Content and Planning PLCs - promote collective teacher efficacy (1.57 effect size); Cognitive task analysis (1.29)

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

Teachers will be supported with the following:

• Clarity of content specific standards and task alignment during planning
• Real time modeling via lesson rehearsals opportunities
• Immediate feedback prior to implementation in the classroom

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.

K-5 teachers will participate in collaborative internalization content PLCs to deepen teachers content knowledge and implementation practices to ensure high leverage strategies ae applied for instruction.

Person Responsible: Shalanda Bell (shalanda.bell@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly monitoring and participation of the PLC process by the school-based administration.

Literacy Teacher Talent Developers, Math Coach, and Gifted Teacher (Science) will
conduct ongoing coaching cycles with an emphasis on explicit modeling
• Leadership Team will utilize baseline classroom walkthrough data to tier teachers based
on need
• Leadership Team will develop and communicate common look fors around standards?aligned instruction
• Leadership team will conduct ongoing classroom walkthroughs to collect data on
implementation of instruction and student data outcomes
• Professional learning will be conducted (Math Content PLCs with strategies, ELA
(English Language Arts) Unit Internalization, and Science Content PLCs.
• Teachers will implement a phonics-based ELA program (UFLI) that focuses on reading
foundational skill building. Using small group instruction, modeling practices and checks
for understanding student ELA achievement will increase

Person Responsible: Corey Jackson (corey.jackson@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing coaching cycles and PLC sessions

#2. 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.

K-5 Teachers will implement a schoolwide behavior positive support system - Cougar Pride with fidelity and implement daily in efforts to strengthen our tier 1 system.

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

80% of our students will adhere to our school-wide behavior system and demonstrate cougar P.R.I.D.E.

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

The area of focused will be monitored through the dissemination of Cougar Cash, and behavior expectations sheets. Teachers will tally weekly and provide parent and student progress updates.

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.)

Check in Connect, Student Mentorship

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

Check In Connect- Research has shown that students have a greater chance to succeed when they are connected to a positive school adult to discuss progress.
Student Mentorship - Research has shown that student academic and behavioral success increases when they are provided consistent adult guidance and support.

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).

-

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

K-2 teachers will participate in collaborative Reading/ELA internalization PLCs to deepen content knowledge of B.E.S.T. standards, plan weekly with grade level PLCs, and DATA Chat PLCs to drive instruction and intervention.

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

3-5 teachers will participate in collaborative Reading/ELA internalization PLCs to deepen content knowledge of B.E.S.T. standards, plan weekly with grade level PLCs, and DATA Chat PLCs to drive instruction and intervention.

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

At least 37% students in grades k-2 will be proficient in Reading as evidenced by scoring on or above level on the Spring PLA standards aligned assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

At least 40% students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in Reading as evidenced by scoring on or above level on the Spring PLA standards aligned 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.

This will be monitored through observation and feedback through the year.
1. Collect trend data K-5 to inform PD.
2. Launch PD (either in planning sessions or whole group depending on the need)
3. Observation and feedback by admin and coaches to inform next steps (which teachers require more support, which teachers are strong examples of implementation to model)
4. Provide more intensive support to teachers who need it.
5. Follow up with another session of walkthroughs and feedback.

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

Jackson, Corey, corey.jackson@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?

Hattie's 2018 updated list of factors related to student achievement: 252 influences and effect sizes
Content and Planning PLCs - promote collective teacher efficacy (1.57 effect size); Cognitive task analysis (1.29); promoting student discussion (.82 effect size)
Students Data Chats - self-reported grades (1.33 effect size); Self-efficacy (.92effect size)
Teachers Data Chats - teachers making predictions about achievement (1.29 effect size); Response to intervention (1.29 effect size); Scaffolding (.82 effect size)
Observation and Feedback to monitor the transfer of practice (.86 effect size)
Safe Practice - deliberate practice for teacher to implement new strategies from PD with support of coaches (.79 effect size)

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?

Yes the evidence-based programs address the n=identified need as they build teacher and student capacity.
The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population as shown by their high effect size.

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
Literacy Leadership: Literacy learning is prioritized by the admin and leadership team. Literacy instruction will be strategically focused on across all subject areas, through the building of vocabulary and content knowledge. Literacy Coaching will be ongoing with itemized support administered to grade level teachers through the PLC planning model. Coaches will provide support with co-teaching, thought partnership, small group instruction and curriculum analysis. Assessment will be used to drive instruction and plan for student support. Assessments will be formal and informal based with exit ticket assessment questions. As a result of student and teacher data, professional development learning opportunities will occur as needed.	Jackson, Corey, corey.jackson@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

-The SIP will be made available to our school stakeholders through a variety of mediums.
1. Through our school webpage. https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/lockhart
2.Through paper dissemination to our student families in our main office. Parents and stakeholders will be provided dates that highlight SIP progress.

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))

-Lockhart intends to conduct student centered events that highlight student academic and behavioral achievement. Parents will be invited to participate.
Lockhart will also conduct parent invited curriculum nights that showcase our magnet theme and core subject highlights.
Progress note parentlink messages will also be shared to families to inform them of student progress.

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))

-Literacy Teacher Talent Developers, Math Coach, and Gifted Teacher (Science) will
conduct ongoing coaching cycles with an emphasis on explicit modeling
• Leadership Team will utilize baseline classroom walkthrough data to tier teachers based
on need
• Leadership Team will develop and communicate common look fors around standards?aligned
instruction
• Leadership team will conduct ongoing classroom walkthroughs to collect data on
implementation of instruction and student data outcomes
• Professional learning will be conducted (Math Content PLCs with strategies, ELA
(English Language Arts) Unit Internalization, and Science Content PLCs.
• Teachers will implement a phonics-based ELA program (UFLI) that focuses on reading
foundational skill building. Using small group instruction, modeling practices and checks
for understanding student ELA achievement will increase

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

-N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

-

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

-

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

-

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

-

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

-