

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Gibsonton 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gibsonton Elementary School

7723 GIBSONTON DR, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To develop a culture where all children feel loved, respected, and encouraged to reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% graduation rate and beyond.

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
Beitelschies, Bree	Principal	The Principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary, adult, ESE or other specialized public school sites. The Principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Feaster, Emily	Teacher, K-12	The School Advisory Council is responsible for final decision making at the school relating to the implementation of the provisions of the annual School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SAC assists in the annual preparation and evaluation of both the SIP and the school's annual budget.
	Reading Coach	Facilitate planning sessions, professional development, data sessions, and provide instructional support to classroom teachers.
Ruck, Marie	Math Coach	Facilitate planning sessions, professional development, data sessions, and provide instructional support to classroom teachers.
Gilmore, Catherine	Parent Engagement Liaison	The Resource Teacher, Site, Community Schools, will work with the school's leadership team (including community and family members, students, school staff, administrators, and educators) to develop a Community School Plan based on a needs and assets assessment. The Resource Teacher, Site, Community Schools, will facilitate and coordinate programs and strategies that align with the school's Community School Plan. The Resource Teacher, Site, Community Schools, will develop, promote, and further the use of community resources to create a positive impact by enhancing community and individual assets, meeting critical human service needs, and promoting long-term community solutions.

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.

Stakeholders will be informed through our Community Schools Initiative, Title 1 and parent involvement meetings, collaborative planning sessions, ILT, and SAC meetings.

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 goals will be regularly monitored through data sessions following each standards-based assessments to ensure students are progressing toward State academic standards.

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	74%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	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	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	24	29	30	24	27	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	3	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	18	20	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	20	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	15	32	30	29	0	0	0	114

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	2	2	8	13	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	24	29	30	24	27	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	3	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	18	20	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	20	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	15	32	30	29	0	0	0	114

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	2	2	8	13	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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*	31	50	53	36	53	56	32		
ELA Learning Gains				53			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			45		
Math Achievement*	63	56	59	55	50	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				56			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			33		
Science Achievement*	38	50	54	28	59	59	22		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	59	59	22			46		

* 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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	217
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	25	Yes	4	2
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	43			

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	55			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	46			

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	31			63			38					60
SWD	16			41			19				5	35
ELL	19			63			22				5	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			61							2	
HSP	25			65			28				5	60
MUL	36			82							2	
PAC												
WHT	36			56			46				4	
FRL	29			60			33				5	54

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	36	53	59	55	56	58	28					22
SWD	14	34	38	27	56	65	5					7
ELL	24	54	77	50	43	42	6					22
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	43	62		67	54							
HSP	34	52	59	54	53	50	21					23
MUL	50			60								
PAC												
WHT	36	51		53	60		40					
FRL	35	54	59	55	56	57	26					22

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	32	46	45	39	34	33	22					46
SWD	16	22	18	25	33	25	8					41
ELL	26	44		31	26		17					46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			50								
HSP	32	48	55	37	30	20	22					46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	30	48		41	39		29					
FRL	31	47	42	38	33	35	23					46

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	54%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	54%	-9%	58%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	23%	46%	-23%	50%	-27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	55%	1%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	47%	-13%	51%	-17%

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.

Proficiency in reading maintained 36% but is still below our goal of 50%. Each year approximately 75% of students come into 3rd grade below level in reading. We have been unable to increase the number of students reading on-level in grades K-2. Students have also struggled with basic number sense therefore most of our very low level 1 students did not make gain in math.

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

Reading proficiency did not change from 2021- 2022 and 2022- 2023. All other academic areas showed increases.

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.

Too many students are below level in the primary grades in reading and mathematics. This gap continues in the intermediate grades. Poor attendance is a primary factor in that 40% of students school less than 90% of the time. We will focus on core instruction and utilize the science of reading to ensure we are closing the gap with intensive small group instruction to accomplish the growth needed.

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

Mathematics proficiency grew from 55% to 64% and Science proficiency grew from 28% to 35%.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, attendance and students not reaching proficiency are the areas of concern.

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

Instructional Priorities: Modeling and Direct Instruction, Student Discourse, Checks for Understanding, Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Description/Instructional Priority: To employ high leverage instructional practices/ structures that allow all students to master the grade level benchmarks.

Rationale: Based on our data, schoolwide reading proficiency stayed the same at 36% from 2021- 2022 to 2022- 2023.

From the data, it is evident that core instruction requires instructional practices aligned to the science of reading. More specifically, in understanding the depth and expectations of grade level standards, planning protocols to support coherent instruction, and implementation of strategies to deliver high-quality, equitable instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023- 2024 school year, as measured by the BEST Standards, scores will increase in grade components as listed below:

ELA Proficiency from 36% to 45%
 Math Proficiency from 64% to 70%
 Science Proficiency from 35% to 40%
 3rd Grade ELA Proficiency from 26% to 30%
 ELA Learning Gains from 52% to 55%
 ELA Lowest 25% will increase from 49% to 50%

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through strategic classroom walkthroughs including quantitative data. Additionally, both formative and adaptive student assessment data will be used to monitor grade-level task alignment to the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bree Beitelschies (bree.beitelschies@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.)

1. Use of student data to provide scaffolded strategies
2. On-going feedback to teachers based on the classroom walkthrough observation data.
3. Facilitated collaborative planning based on student data analysis
4. Professional development for grade-level standards-based instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

After analyzing student data, the need for scaffolded instruction was determined, based on the number of students performing below grade level. The further development of teachers' expertise through ongoing feedback, professional development, and collaboration through planning sessions was determined from walkthroughs during 2022- 2023. These strategies

will ensure students receive instruction aligned to expectations of the grade-level standards and the science of reading.
to meet learners' needs.

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.

1a. Reading coaches and teacher leaders will facilitate planning for grades k-5 for 50 minutes at least twice weekly. Planning sessions will focus on benchmarks to teach, small group instruction, assessment for learning, checks for understanding with data chats to discuss success as well as reteach to increase mastery of the benchmark.

1b. Coaches and instructional aides will pull targeted groups for teaching unmastered prerequisite skills in grades K-5 at least three times a week. Teachers will pull small groups daily that are targeted toward student need based on assessment data. Subgroups ELL and SWD will be included in all targeted groups.

1c. Coaches and teacher leaders will provide professional development to strengthen instructional practices and delivery. One professional development session per quarter with small group sessions or professional development as needed. Administrators will give feedback toward progress.

1d. After school opportunities will be utilized to increase student learning time.

Person Responsible: Bree Beitelschies (bree.beitelschies@hcps.net)

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Gibsonton Elementary began CHAMPS as our Tier 1 Behavior Management Plan after identifying a need for a school-wide plan. During the 2020- 2021 school year, we had 192 Behavior Trackers input into EdConnect, 61 Referrals, and 18 suspensions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to increase student time on task and reduce the need for Behavior Trackers, Referrals, and Suspensions by 50% or more.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor student in class behavior and administration will monitor the use of behavior trackers and referrals to provide positive interventions to increase student time spent learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bree Beitelshies (bree.beitelshies@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.)

Restorative practices is the evidence based intervention we use as a school to strengthening relationships and connections between individuals. Restorative practices is a social science that studies how to improve and repair relationships between people and communities. The purpose is to build healthy communities, increase social capital, and repair harm and restore relationships. The 5R's of restorative practices are Relationship, Respect, Responsibility, Repair and Reintegration. The way we implement Restorative Practices are through community-building circles (morning meetings), norm setting, community circles for content, and restorative chats.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the 2022- 2023 school we saw increased teacher retention and student culture due to the implementation of Restorative Practices.

Highlights from our insight survey:

- Students at my school can achieve the academic standards for their grade level 43%- 75%
- Across my school there are consistent expectations and consequences 36%- 65%
- Interactions between students and adults at my school demonstrate mutual care and respect 36%- 78%
- School leaders promote a safe and productive learning environment 59%- 91%
- School leaders provide me with the support I need to maintain high standards for student behavior 50%- 87%

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on teacher assessments and iReady assessments in May of 2023, 39% of kindergarten students, 70% of first grade students, and 74% of second grade students were one year or more below grade level. Students are struggling in all grade levels particularly in the areas of decoding and fluency (foundational skills). Teachers will utilize placement level assessments to identify the specific target area of need to tailor their instruction around each students needs to address these gaps.

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

Based on 2023 FSA scores, 36% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level three or higher on ELA FSA. On iReady, 42% of 3rd- 5th grade students are still in the foundational skills grouping. Students are struggling in all grade levels particularly in the areas of decoding and fluency (foundational skills). Teachers will utilize placement level assessments to identify the specific target area of need to tailor their instruction around each students needs to address these gaps.

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

Greater than 50% of students in grade k-2 will show they are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment in May of 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Greater than 50% of students in grade 3-5 will show they are on track to pass or score equivalent to a level 3 or higher on the statewide ELA assessment in May of 2024.

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

Students progress will be monitored by the state progress monitoring three times a year and also by district informal assessments. After each assessment, teachers will disaggregate student results and plan for changes to instruction or small group intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Beitelschies, Bree, bree.beitelschies@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?

K-2: Dibels, Wonders, and Iready

3-5: Dibels, Wonders, and Iready

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?

Materials in all levels are used for intensive small group instruction to address the area of need. Instruction is tailored to the individual student or small group.

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
<p>1. Reading coaches and teacher leaders will facilitate planning for grades k-5 for 50 minutes at least twice weekly. Planning sessions will focus on benchmarks to teach, small group instruction, assessment for learning, and use of schoolwide instructional priorities with data chats to discuss success as well as reteach to increase mastery of the benchmark.</p> <p>2.. Coaches and instructional aides will pull small targeted groups for teaching unmastered prerequisite skills in grades K-5 at least three times a week. Teachers will pull small groups daily that are targeted toward student needs based on data gleaned from standards-based assessment.</p> <p>3. Coaches and teacher leaders will provide targeted professional development to strengthen instructional practices and delivery. One professional development session per quarter with small group sessions or professional development as needed. Administrators will give feedback toward progress.</p>	<p>Beitelschies, Bree, bree.beitelschies@hcps.net</p>

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.

We will hold a meeting to vote on the SIP and host a parent meeting to discuss the school improvement plan.

This is the school webpage where the SIP can be located: <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/gibsonton>

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))

Through our Community School Initiative, Gibsonton Elementary conducts surveys to all stakeholders to find out the needs and barriers to success for all students. The Community Resource teacher works with families and staff to meet the various needs that come up through out the year. We will also use the results

from the Panorama Survey of students to identify areas of SEL needs that can be worked on to strengthen

the social/emotional for all students. Specifically we will:

1. Integrated Supports: Address student needs and barriers that impact Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and peer relationship development through strong collaboration with families, and mentoring programs.
2. Extended Learning Time: Increase student access to expanded and enriched learning through more frequent small-group learning opportunities, to include student-led supports
3. Active family and community engagement: Integrate approaches that pair community, family, and school together to increase positive relationships, awareness and involvement in various opportunities (such as classroom programs, PTA, school-wide events) while addressing family barriers.
4. Collaborative Leadership and Practices: Through collaborative efforts by all interest holders, we will increase voice, agency and involvement with the goal of increasing school and classroom culture by building relationships with each individual student and their family, to identify what motivates them (passion and purpose).

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)

Small group instruction, ELP afterschool learning clubs, and in school lunch-bunch tutoring.

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))

Instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and ELP teachers will be utilized to enrich and accelerate learning.