# Foster Elementary School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

## Foster Elementary School

### 2014 E DIANA 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:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>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.**

Foster Elementary will provide a welcoming environment where stakeholders exchange ideas & strategies that will result in a rigorous, differentiated academic experience. Foster Elementary will promote stability through social emotional learning that will help build relationships across the community.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Foster is a community school that empowers all stakeholders to work together, creating lifelong learners.

## School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

### School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Smith, Antonio | Principal | The principal and AP exercise instructional leadership by monitoring the learning environment and supporting. teacher growth through observation and actionable feedback. Based on that data, teams are provided with differentiated supports from school leaders and coaches. Oversee all school operations, Oversees the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), facilitates PD, MTSS process, oversees all budgets, SAC, PTA, Family engagement, CST, Teacher evaluations and walk throughs, facilitates the School Leadership Team and the Instructional leadership team. |
| Schlitt, Aimee | Instructional Coach | Leader in Mathematics and Science. Promote a culture of collaboration and high standards for instruction. Support school leadership by helping to develop and implement goals and action steps to increase reading and writing achievement. Build capacity by increasing teacher leadership. Support math and science curriculum lesson planning aligned to standards and within grade level limitations. Facilitate Math/Sci PD, work with teachers during collaborative planning. Develop, monitor, and assist teachers in analysis and use of math/science formative assessments to drive instruction. Ensure interim assessment are completed by all grade levels. Monitor pacing of the math/science instructional calendar to ensure all standards are taught. Engage teachers in doing the math prior to instructing students. Monitoring and supported math block and intervention. Math ILT leader. Monitor and take action on all data related to math/sci including learning computer-based programs. Analyze and interpret math data and use it to help guide lesson planning, assessment, coaching, and effective action planning. Service small groups for students needing intervention and enrichment. Supporting curriculum planning and PLC's. Engage in Learning Walks with ILT. Attend monthly district coaching meetings and implement ideas/tasks. Provide teachers with constructive, honest, and actionable feedback to continuously improve instructional practice. |

**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 Leadership Team is comprised of administrators, teachers, non-instructional staff, parents, community partners, and members of the SAC. The Leadership Team met to begin collaborating on the development of School Improvement Plan. We reviewed school demographic and historical data to determine trends and progress. We analyzed and triangulated data from a variety of assessments including STAR Renaissance, FAST, Iready Diagnostics, attendance and district common assessments. Based on trends, we able to develop academic goals for the 2023-2024 school year.

**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 Instructional Leadership Team will help implement and monitor the School Improvement Plan by regularly meeting to evaluate progress of instructional priorities. We will use a variety of assessments to measure performance and make plan revisions as necessary to support continuous improvement. Assessments include Iready, DIBELS, UFLI weekly assessments, and STAR & FAST cycles.

## 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** | 97% |
| **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: F 2018-19: F 2017-18: D |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** | |

## Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 18 | 20 | 21 | 5 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 26 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 29 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 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* | 29 | 50 | 53 | 25 | 53 | 56 | 31 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 41 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 57 | | | 73 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 34 | 56 | 59 | 35 | 50 | 50 | 30 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 64 | | | 67 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 16 | 50 | 54 | 22 | 59 | 59 | 27 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 69 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 56 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 48 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 62 | 59 | 59 | 42 | | | 53 | | |

*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 | 35 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 173 |
| 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 | 45 |

| 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 | 361 |
| 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 | 26 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| HSP | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 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 | 38 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 43 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | |
| HSP | 48 | | | |

| 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 | 45 | | | |

**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 | 29 | | | 34 | | | 16 | | | | | 62 |
| SWD | 24 | | | 24 | | | 31 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 25 | | | 44 | | | | | | | 4 | 62 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | | | 27 | | | 13 | | | | 5 | 62 |
| HSP | 33 | | | 51 | | | 30 | | | | 5 | 60 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | | | 32 | | | 13 | | | | 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 | 25 | 50 | 57 | 35 | 66 | 64 | 22 | | | | | 42 |
| SWD | 21 | 38 | | 29 | 65 | 64 | 9 | | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 64 | 64 | 31 | 68 | | 13 | | | | | 42 |
| 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 | 24 | 44 | 50 | 33 | 66 | 65 | 23 | | | | | 57 |
| HSP | 33 | 74 | | 53 | 71 | | 18 | | | | | 36 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 25 | 50 | 57 | 35 | 67 | 64 | 21 | | | | | 43 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 31 | 41 | 73 | 30 | 50 | 67 | 27 | | | | | 53 |
| SWD | 34 | 53 | | 31 | 60 | | 27 | | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 42 | | 33 | 75 | | | | | | | 53 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 43 | 75 | 26 | 51 | 64 | 21 | | | | | 50 |
| HSP | 38 | | | 46 | | | | | | | | 57 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 30 | 40 | 79 | 29 | 49 | 67 | 26 | | | | | 53 |

**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 | 33% | 53% | -20% | 54% | -21% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 26% | 54% | -28% | 58% | -32% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 25% | 46% | -21% | 50% | -25% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 55% | -9% | 59% | -13% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 26% | 59% | -33% | 61% | -35% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 23% | 53% | -30% | 55% | -32% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 12% | 47% | -35% | 51% | -39% |

## 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.**

Based on data from the STAR data from K,1st, and 2nd grade, foundational skills will need to be a focus for current K-2 students...see below percentages. Our current 3rd & 4th graders performed lower than expected on the FAST PMA 3 Reading in comprehension and vocabulary. Moreover, algebraic thinking across all grade levels need improvement as seen in the data from FAST and Iready.

STAR (scoring below the 40th percentile)
K=56%
1=78%
2=52%

FAST (Scoring below the 40th percentile)
3=73%
4=75%
5=66%

Learning loss due to covid and hybrid teaching as well as instructional vacancies, which led to inconsistent instruction for students. Skill deficits will be addressed using UFLI curriculum, Iready phonics lessons.

Iready math data and quarterly assessment will be used to monitor student progress and make informed decisions.

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

Grade 1 showed the greatest decline from the prior year (78% below the 40th percentile). Students struggled on to make adequate gains on STAR and Iready reading and math. Contributing factors include teacher turnover throughout the school year, both certified and long-terms substitutes with limited and varying levels of teaching experience and expertise, which impacted student's ability to master grade level benchmarks.

**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.**

FAST data from grades 3 & 4 had the greatest gap when compared to state averages (3rd=73%, 4th =75% below the 40th percentile. Some students were promoted to 3rd grade without evidence of mastery of the previous year's academic reading and mathematics benchmarks. Some or most had critical skill deficits in reading ability due to loss of instruction. Students in 4th grade had major reading skill deficits in which prevented them from being able to challenge grade level content, which involved use of phonics knowledge, decoding skills, comprehension, and vocabulary. Over multiple school years, these students did not receive adequate small group instruction to meet their needs.

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

Based on the FAST Math Spring assessment, 3rd grade made the most improvement with approximately 46% of students scoring at Level 3 or higher in math. New actions included keeping the team together, fostering collaboration between grade levels, and exposure to new of progress monitoring students throughout the school year.

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

After reflection of the EWS data form Part 1, a potential area of concern is the number of students in grade 3-5, scoring within the range of Level 1 in reading and mathematics. Achievement is these grade levels is a major concern. Our focus this school year is to help students (K-5) achieve a year or more of learning gains.

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

The highest priority for school improvement is to strengthen reading instruction K-5, which will equip teachers with the knowledge of how to meet the needs of learners they serve. Focusing on explicit modeling will ensure teachers are appropriately modeling instruction through modeling thinking, chunking content into digestible bites, visuals, and use of effectively formative assessing students to make sure students have a good understanding of what they are learning and how to execute the tasks. Using new curriculum and resources to provide small group instruction will help students improve their reading skills. As a school, we want to increase reading proficiency and the number of students making learning gains.

Math instruction is another priority. We have new math curriculum and teachers are still adjusting to newer methods or frameworks for teaching mathematics. Some of our teachers have limited knowledge and misconceptions of their own as it relates to effectively instruct in the area of math. We want students to be able to engage in rigorous problem-solving with peer discourse, which will allow them to share thinking and ask questions. Teachers need to have a better understanding of how to address incorrect

answers and misconceptions. The math coach will facilitate common planning and support teachers through the use of effective coaching cycles and professional development. As a school, we want to increase math proficiency and the number of students making learning gains.

**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.

Employ high leverage instructional practices/structures that allow students to master grade level benchmarks. Specific focus:

• Create school-wide explicit modeling practices to enhance teacher pedagogy and increase student proficiency toward grade-level benchmarks.

• Provide guidance to all teachers in their planning and execution of high-quality small group instruction. This support will specifically target instructional delivery methods that require students to actively engage in the learning process, as well as tier 2 instruction aimed at narrowing the achievement gap and achieving proficiency on grade-level benchmarks.

Rationale: Historical data shows that students struggle to meet proficiency targets in ELA, Math, and Science. According to 2023 FAST PM3 results, 28% of students were proficient in ELA and 32% of students were proficient in Math. According to 2023 FSSA results, 12% of students were proficient in Science. Foster has established a foundation for the core instruction through regular common planning sessions and coaching support. With core instruction in the infancy stage, it will be important to provide teacher support with explicit modeling and high-quality aggressive monitoring. These core focus areas will promote teacher efficacy in ensuring instructional scaffolds provided to students are in alignment with their current level of ability and help them to reach grade-level targets. In addition, effective small group instructional routines need to be established in classrooms to reinforce the core concepts and guide students towards achieving proficiency in grade-level benchmarks. Teachers continue to demonstrate a need for additional supports to strengthen and monitor effectiveness of core and small group instruction.

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

By October 2023, at least 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data. By December 2023, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data.
This will result in grades 3-5 FAST/FSSA proficiency scores increasing in ELA, Math, and Science (see breakdown below):
-Increase ELA proficiency from 28% to 40%
-Increase Math proficiency from 32% to 45%
-Increase Science proficiency from 12% to 25%

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

The school administration team will regularly attend weekly common planning and PLC sessions to ensure planning and teacher support are in alignment with teacher needs in the focus area of small group instruction. In addition, walkthrough look-for trend data will be collected and shared with teachers regularly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@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 evidenced-based strategy being used to support this area of focus is Teacher Clarity. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning Indicators, strong Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75, which falls in the "Zone of Desired Effects". Teacher Clarity is described as helping students gauge their own progress through the use of success criteria, and intentional and deliberate feedback. In addition, strong teacher clarity is evident when the teacher and students are partners in explaining the intended learning targets.

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

This evidenced-based strategy was selected to support the target area of focus because with strong teacher clarity on all learning targets (both core and small group instruction), students will be more in alignment with their own learning goals. In addition, according to John Hattie's research, actions falling in the range of 0.40 and above, learning extends beyond that which was expected from attending school for one school year. Due to the significant gaps our students demonstrate, we need to employ evidence-based strategies that will support larger than one year's growth.

**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.

Teachers will be provided with personalized in-classroom coaching that focusses on addressing their unique needs, their identified tier, and the school improvement plan. By analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data, the appropriate coaching support, and tiers for teachers will be determined. Identified teachers will be provided specific coaching in the outlined areas of focus: explicit modeling and small group instruction.

Administration will consistently monitor the impact of coaching schedules and caseloads and collaborate with coaches, to ensure teachers are receiving the appropriate level of support.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing actionable feedback using a tracker to evaluate progression toward instructional priorities.

Teachers will engage in weekly common planning periods and (content PLCs/unit internalizations) facilitated by a coach or lead teacher. Based on identified teacher caseloads, weekly common planning periods and ongoing (content PLCs/unit internalization sessions) will be facilitated by identified coaches. Administration team will attend planning sessions regularly to ensure fidelity of coach-facilitated implementation and teacher engagement. Administration team will conduct walkthroughs (according to walkthrough schedule) to ensure transfer of plans to practice and provide specific teacher feedback in reference to planned lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** Walkthroughs occur daily. Planning sessions are scheduled weekly, facilitated by instructional coaches.

Coaches, Resource Teachers, Lead Teachers, and Administration will design and implement ongoing professional development opportunities for teachers to build capacity in the three identified areas of focus: explicit modeling, aggressive monitoring, and small group instruction (other identified areas as well, if needed).

Administration will conduct walkthroughs (according to walkthrough schedule) to ensure transfer of professional development to practice and provide specific teacher feedback in the focus areas.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will conduct weekly Learning Walks to observe teaching, student learning and responses to instruction, and determine coaching supports..

Teachers will participate in coach/teacher-lead facilitated ongoing formative and summative Data Chats. Data Chats will include an analysis of various assessment data sets, student work, and action planning for future instruction.

Administration will conduct accountability walks to ensure teachers are held accountable for implementation of action plans drafted during Data Chats.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** Data chats will occur following cycle assessments to help teacher's triangulate and make action plans in an effort to intervene and disrupt the classroom data.

**#2. 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.

During the 2021-22 school year, 25 percent of students missed 10% or more of school. Due to Covid-19, multiple students experienced sickness or quarantine. There was not a systematic process for monitoring student attendance and taking action. Teachers did not follow attendance protocols for reporting student absences with consistency. Attendance data demonstrates a need to focus on improving student attendance across grade levels. If we implement a strategic attendance plan for informing families of the importance of
school attendance, attendance award recognition programs, district supported strategies to enforce attendance, and ways to connect families with community resources to meet their needs, the number of students missing 10% or more would decrease from 25% to 15%.

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

If we improve our process for monitoring and reporting student attendance, we will increase the number of students with regular attendance by 10 percent (25 percent with 10% or more absences to lesson than 15 percent) as compared to the previous school year.

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

Administrators and Social Worker will participate in bi-weekly attendance meetings to utilize the problem-solving worksheet for grade level attendance. The social worker will implement district procedures for monitoring and taking action for students with chronic absences and tardies. The school social worker conduct home visits and
schedule parent conferences with families who have truancy issues.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@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.)

Foster will implement a systematic process for aggressive monitoring of student attendance and support the needs of students and families.

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

Daily student attendance matters to the educational success of each student. The current level of absences at 10% or more is 25% as evidenced in the district student database. The problem/gap is occurring due to insufficient interventions are in place to prevent barriers to school attendance starting at the beginning of the school year. If incentives for students and families would occur at the beginning, the problem would be reduced by at least 10%.

**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 2 - Moderate 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.

Attendance Committee will meet bi-weekly to discuss and monitor student attendance. The committee will track students who have missed multiple days of schools and implement district processes for reporting student attendance. We will implement use of an electronic spreadsheet to monitor and track student truancy. Additionally, we intervene early by educating and notifying families of the importance of school attendance.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** Aug 2023 - May 2024

Engage students and families in attendance related activities/incentives to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance based on research through targeted parent meetings, conference nights and outreach by teachers and staff.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** Aug 2023-May 2024

Utilize members of our Student Services team to reach out to families via calls, email, letters and home visits to re-engage hard to reach families, check on student welfare and ensure that students' basic needs are being met in a safe environment.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** Aug 2023-May 2024

Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes. (e.g. Pending entries cleared)

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** Aug 2023-May 2024

**#3. 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.

Students with Disabilities is an identified subgroup according to ESSA data, scoring 38% proficiency in reading, which is below the proficiency criteria for ESSA (41% or higher).

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

Students' w/Disabilities will increase achievement from 38% to 45% as measured by the Spring FAST PMA 3 assessment.

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

Regularly scheduled meetings with VE Resource teachers will be held to review student achievement data for SWD's. We will pinpoint and use a variety of data points including DIBELS assessments, classroom assessments, Iready diagnostic, STAR, and FAST to evaluate learning outcomes. Classroom walkthrough will include look-fors based on engagement and intentional differentiation by the teacher to meet the needs of all SWD's.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@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.)

Brainstorming is an intervention used for Specially Designed Instruction. Students will receive this intervention based on IEP goals. DIBELs assessments will serve to capture a starting point for students in terms of identifying skills gaps in reading. SWD's will also be routinely assessed using progress monitoring tools based on IEP recommendations.

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

Brainstorming is an evidence-based intervention best known for improving students 'reading abilities.

**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.

Increase professional development opportunities for VE Resource teachers to receive training on new instructional practices to support SWD's.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** Aug 2023-May 2024

Review and modify VE Resource schedules to ensure students all students receive support across subject areas. We will develop a schedule that supports both Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) and push-in support for benchmark instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Collaborative space and time for VE Resource and General Education teachers to collaborate via lesson planning, utilization of instructional practices that best support SWD's during core instruction, and data analysis.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Goal setting and reflection with SWD's between VE Resource teachers and students. Teachers will work with students to develop goals based on academic performance data, which will help students take ownership of the learning and progress.

**Person Responsible:** Antonio Smith (antonio.smith@hcps.net)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Funding allocations to support school improvement will be used to meet our set proficiency targets. Using strategic action planning, we will align needed resources to school goals, instructional priorities, and action steps. We will continue to monitor academic performance data and survey the needs of teachers to enhance delivery of instruction.

## 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**

Data from the 2022-23 STAR Renaissance/FAST Assessment, given in the Spring of 2023 indicate the following percentage at each grade who scored below 40th percentile on STAR...
Kdg = 56%
Gr. 1= 78%
Gr. 2= 52%

Based on the data from above, we will implement the UFLI curriculum with K-2 students to build foundational skills development. Foundational skills will help students improve reading ability by understanding basic literacy skills. In the early stages of reading, it imperative that foundational skills are mastered because if not, it will be a challenge for students to read and comprehend grade level text.

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

Data from the 2022-23 FAST Assessment, given in the Spring of 2023 indicate the following percentage at each grade who scored below 40th percentile on FAST...

Gr. 3=73% FAST
Gr. 4=75% FAST
Gr. 5=66% FAST

Based on data from the FAST assessment, we will focus on strengthening core instruction via explicit modeling, which will ensure students are ready and able to demonstrate success on independent tasks. Instruction and tasks will be tightly aligned to the B.E.S.T standards. Students will also be engaged in the use of grade-level appropriate complex text. Foundational skills will be part of the ELA instructional framework, which will ensure students receive instruction that supports phonemic awareness, phonics and vocabulary which will promote literacy for all and help students read and comprehend grade level text.

**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

By the Spring cycle of STAR, students in grades K-2 at Foster Elementary School will increase the number of students at each grade who are performing on or above grade level.
Kdg = 44% to 54%
Gr. 1= 22% to 50%
Gr. 2= 48% to 60%

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the Spring cycle of FAST, students in grades 3-5 at Foster Elementary School will increase the number of students at each grade level who are performing on or above grade level.
grades in 3, 4, 5 will consistently make incremental proficiency gains for ELA on each cycle assessment.

On the first Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA), ELA will serve as baseline data for grades 3, 4, 5. We expect to see incremental growth toward our goals based on each 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.

The ELA instructional framework includes a word work component using the UFLI curriculum. Teachers will administer UFLI weekly assessment to determine mastery. In addition, Tier 3 and students and those who score below the 20% percentile on Iready Diagnostic will be progress monitored using DIBELS assessments.

During common planning, instructional coaches will support teachers in planning for phonics instruction and
demonstrate effective ways to teach/ and apply research-based methods to infuse vocabulary development
into the content, which will allow students to access grade level text. Weekly, teachers will participate in common planning with their team, led by instructional coaches.

Using the Iready Diagnostic cycle data and reports, we will monitor to ensure students complete weekly lessons and usage on Iready. During walkthroughs, teachers will receive actionable feedback as it relates to teaching foundational skills and shared reading. Moreover, the ILT will meet to discuss data from Iready and other assessments to inform decision-making.

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

Smith, Antonio, antonio.smith@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?

To provide teachers with increased opportunities to pre-teach, re-teach, and enrich grade level B.E.S.T standards, Foster Elementary School will continue implementing UFLI curriculum to support improved foundational skills. Teachers will administer UFLI weekly assessments to measure performance based on student mastery of skills.

**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?

Providing additional practice time during the school day for students to receive instruction based on data and individual needs will increase both reading proficiency. Moreover, we want to increase proficiency of African American students in order to close the achievement gap between black and non-black students as
well as increase achievement for students with disabilities.

**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 Action Team | Smith, Antonio, antonio.smith@hcps.net |
| Literacy Coaching to improve pedagogy and strengthen delivery of instructional practices. | Smith, Antonio, antonio.smith@hcps.net |
| Assessments | Smith, Antonio, antonio.smith@hcps.net |
| Professional Learning | Smith, Antonio, antonio.smith@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 and the Title I Schoolwide Program plan are disseminated to stakeholders by posting on the school website. These plans will also be shared with stakeholders during PTA and SAC meetings. Copies of the SIP and SWP may be emailed to stakeholders upon request. Future SAC meetings will include progress and evidence toward meeting overarching goals.

**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 will continue to build positive relationships with stakeholders using effective channels of communication such as, use of social media, emails, parent messenger, school newsletters, and phone calls. The school will hold events throughout the school to invite families on campus to be an active participant in their child's learning. Stakeholders are encouraged to join SAC and PTA help fulfill our school's mission.

**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)**

As we continue throughout the school year, we will repeatedly spiral back to academic benchmarks to help students demonstrate mastery. Explicit modeling and small group instruction are our two instructional priorities. Professional development will focus on these two priorities to strengthen core instruction as well as meet the individual needs of learners. Iready Diagnostic, STAR, and FAST will be used for progress monitoring purposes.

**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 plan supports ESSA subgroup with the intent to meet the needs of each students. Our head

**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))**

-

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |

### Budget Approval

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

Yes