

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Desoto Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Desoto Elementary School

2618 CORRINE ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[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.

DeSoto creates
Responsible citizens by focusing on
Academic
Growth and
Ownership of learning in a
Nurturing and
Safe environment.

School website: www.hillsboroughschools.org/desoto

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering every child, every day, through love, learning, and leadership.

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
Tirelli, Emily	Principal	
Allen, Lindsay	Assistant Principal	

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.

School leadership team met prior to the closing of the 2022-2023 school year to analyze multiple forms of data, complete root cause analysis, and plan for priorities and strategies. The SAC committee was consulted for feedback on the plan. Parent surveys were conducted to elicit feedback of the strengths and needs of the school.

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 monitored on a monthly basis by the Instructional Leadership Team and the School Advisory Committee. Multiple data sources, including FAST, iReady Diagnostic, district assessments

and school assessments will be used to monitor the effectiveness of strategies on the achievement of students, including students with the greatest achievement gaps. During each review, members will analyze data and determine if revisions are needed to best support students.

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	91%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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	13	9	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
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	9	5	0	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8	
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	7	4	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	12	7	11	6	10	0	0	0	46	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	9	10	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	7	4	0	0	0	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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

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	12	7	11	6	10	0	0	0	46	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	9	10	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	7	4	0	0	0	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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

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*	34	50	53	40	53	56	33		
ELA Learning Gains				54			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			60		
Math Achievement*	56	56	59	64	50	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				71			85		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63					
Science Achievement*	29	50	54	35	59	59	28		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	82	59	59	56			64		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	224
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
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	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
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	21	Yes	1	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	1	1
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	39	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	46			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	54			

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				
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	34			56			29					82
SWD	13			25							3	
ELL	32			64			14				5	82
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			14							2	
HSP	34			62			22				5	82
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	29			46			17				5	83

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	40	54	38	64	71	63	35					56
SWD	24	50		43	67							
ELL	39	49	40	71	71		26					56
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	19	50		44	50							
HSP	41	51	46	68	73	64	33					56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35	50	38	63	69	60	30					54

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	33	51	60	52	85		28					64
SWD	14	33		18	67							30
ELL	33	58		53	85		35					64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	12			18								
HSP	36	59		55	86		32					64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	30	51	60	48	84		26					63

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	40%	53%	-13%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	54%	-6%	58%	-10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	24%	46%	-22%	50%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	55%	4%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	61%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	26%	47%	-21%	51%	-25%

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 area of proficiency was in science. According to the 2023 SSA assessment, only 28% of our students reached a level 3 or higher. After analyzing multiple data sources, we have determined that our students struggle to demonstrate their understanding of science concepts due to lack of content-specific vocabulary understanding and reading comprehension strategies.

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

The percentage of students reaching a level 3 or higher in both math and science decreased by 5 percent according to the Spring 2023 state assessments for students in grades 3-5. This decline can be attributed to teacher vacancies and lack of teacher experience in grades 4 and 5.

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 ELA scores continue to be a concern, as only 39% of our students in grades 3-5 reached a provisional level 3 or higher by the Spring 2023 FAST administration. Approximately 40% of our students are current or former ELL students. We know that multi-language learners need additional time and support to develop language comprehension skills. This is an area that we must continue to develop to support our students.

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

The instructional culture and leadership of the school improved as measured by the 2023 Insight Survey, which surveys parents, staff and faculty.

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

42 of our students were absent for 10% of the total number of school days or more. 32 students in grades 3-5 earned a Level 1 on the FAST ELA assessment.

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

Science Proficiency
ELA Proficiency
Math Proficiency

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 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.

According to the Early Warning System, 38 of our students in grades K-5 were absent for 10% or more of the total days of school. More specifically, 30 of those students were in grades K-2.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students with 10% or higher absenteeism rates will decrease to less than 15 students for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored quarterly during Student Services meetings, monthly through our MTSS meetings, and monthly by our School Advisory Council.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@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.)

The MTSS process will be used to identify students who have missed 5 days or more during each quarter. The MTSS team will meet to plan appropriate interventions and create a monitoring plan. The team will reconvene every six weeks to determine the effectiveness of the planned interventions and make revisions as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A robust MTSS process allows for the team to convene, determine root causes for the area of need, and create an intervention plan to address the need. In this case, this will increase instructional time received by improving attendance.

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.

The school social worker will serve as the chair for the attendance MTSS team. The team will meet every six weeks to monitor student attendance, plan interventions, and monitor fidelity of interventions.

Person Responsible: Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

By When: MTSS team meetings will begin on September 18, 2023 and will meet every Monday in six weeks cycles with each grade level team.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**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.

Teachers will employ purposeful classroom discussions and language development strategies that allow all students to master the grade level benchmarks.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By January 2024, 100% of classrooms will be implementing purposeful classroom discussions and language development strategies (implementation phase 2 or higher) as measured during classroom walkthroughs and observations.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted weekly by administrators. Trend data will be collected during each walkthrough and analyzed by the leadership team at weekly leadership meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@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 discussions will be used to increase student engagement and deepen understanding of concepts. Specific discourse structures, such as turn and talk, 1-1-1, Stand up/Hand Up/Pair Up, and consensus maps will be used in all classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to John Hattie's research, classroom discussions have an effectiveness rating of 0.82.

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.

Professional Development will be provided to all teachers on the use of specific discourse structures.

Person Responsible: Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

By When: August 2023

Weekly Common Planning for core and small group instruction will include revised protocols and templates for strategic planning of student discourse.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Allen (lindsay.allen@hcps.net)

By When: August 2023

Ongoing coaching and feedback provided by administration and teacher leaders will focus on specific observables related to classroom discussion and effective small group instruction

Person Responsible: Emily Tirelli (emily.tirelli@hcps.net)

By When: September - October 2023

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

Teachers will provide daily whole group and small group instruction in grades K-2 using UFLI materials to explicitly and systematically teach foundational skills to all students.

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

Teachers in grades 3-5 will use daily small group instruction to provide students with opportunities to receive appropriate scaffolding when engaging with tasks aligned to the grade-level benchmarks.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

According to Spring 2023 STAR ELA data, 59% of students who were in 1st grade in 2022-2023 scored below the 40th %tile. This data calls for a more systematic approach to foundational skills in the primary

grades. Our goal for 2023-2024 is that at least 60% of students in grades K-2 will score above the 40th %tile as evidenced by the Spring 2024 administration of STAR.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to the Spring FAST ELA assessment, 81% of students in grade 3 and 57% of students in grade 5 scores below a level 3. Small group instruction will allow teachers to appropriately scaffold students as they engage in challenging benchmark-aligned tasks. As a result, less than 50% of students in grades 3-5 will score below a level 3 as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of FAST ELA.

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.

Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect trend data on the implementation of the instructional practices. Feedback will be provided to teachers after each walkthrough and observation. The instructional leadership team will meet after each administration of FAST, STAR and iReady Diagnostic assessments to monitor student growth toward our goals.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tirelli, Emily, emily.tirelli@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?

UFLI, an evidence-based program, will be used in all K-2nd grade classrooms to provide explicit, systematic instruction in literacy foundational skills. The district has ensured alignment with the B.E.S.T. Standards for each grade level through the recommended scope and sequence.

Small group instruction is an evidence-based practice that will be used daily in all 3rd-5th grade ELA classrooms in order to support students' development of foundational skills, vocabulary, and comprehension.

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?

UFLI addresses the foundational skills that are lacking in our primary students. Small group instruction, by design, supports students' individual and group needs through differentiated scaffolding, modeling and practice opportunities.

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
Professional Development focused on the implementation of UFLI will be provided to all K-2 ELA teachers during preplanning week (August 2). Professional Development focused on small group instruction will be provided to all 3rd-5th grade students during pre-planning week (August 2).	Allen, Lindsay, lindsay.allen@hcps.net
Feedback and coaching will be provided by administration to all K-2 teachers on the implementation of UFLI curriculum. Feedback and coaching will be provided to all grades 3-5 teachers on the implementation of small group instruction.	Tirelli, Emily, emily.tirelli@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 and Title I budget will be reviewed monthly at our SAC meetings. The SIP will also be linked on our website (hillsboroughschools.org/desoto) when available for all parents and stakeholders to review. The SIP will be shared with parents through the quarterly newsletter as well.

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))

The school builds positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders using various forms of communication. Weekly communication folders are used by all teachers and students to provide consistent communication between the school and parents. Text messages are used to share pertinent, timely information with parents as needed. The SAC meets monthly as a means of collaboration and communication with parents and community partners. This year, our school's food pantry will open once per week to provide food and household items free of charge to 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)

Through a consistent and robust MTSS process, interventions for academic progress, behavior, and attendance are planned and monitored by a team of educators and parents. Instruction is monitored and strengthened through ongoing classroom walkthroughs, feedback, and professional development opportunities. The instructional leadership team meets twice a month to analyze current data and plan for response to the data.

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))

This year, we have created a food pantry that is open for all DeSoto families and community members. We expect this resource to provide additional support to our families and continue to build positive relationships with stakeholders.

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))

DeSoto is implementing the 7 Mindsets program schoolwide to develop students' ability to be resilient, proactive, and positive in their life choices. DeSoto partners with the Pete L. Mulry Foundation to provide one-on-one mentors to students in need of academic, behavioral, or social-emotional support. We also have a Chrysalis counselor who comes to our school to provide mental health counseling weekly for students.

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A