

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Kenly Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	16
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Kenly Elementary School

2909 N 66TH ST, Tampa, FL 33619

[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.

The community of scholars evolving into tomorrow's leaders!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kenly ensures an equitable education that empowers students to be successful.

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
Cooley, Jeffrey	Principal	Principal

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School advisory Council participants include: Principal, Teachers, Parents, Community members, and business partners. Surveys are used throughout the year to support the development of the SIP.

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))

Regularly scheduled School Advisory Council Meetings. School leadership and School Advisory Council will monitor student data using K-12 Lift. K-12 Lift report monitors student achievement across multiple subgroups included in ESSA.

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	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: B 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 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	1	36	27	26	27	27	0	0	0	144	
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	10	7	9	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	38	36	0	0	0	0	74	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	19	26	0	0	0	0	45	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	36	0	0	0	0	74	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	26	0	0	0	0	45	
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	2	9	19	24	0	0	0	54

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	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 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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in 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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	20	50	53	27	53	56	24		
ELA Learning Gains				53			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			72		
Math Achievement*	43	56	59	51	50	50	38		
Math Learning Gains				72			81		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				88			94		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	27	50	54	37	59	59	30		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	59	59	69			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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	159
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
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	15	Yes	1	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	24	Yes	1	1
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	30	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	50			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	54			

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	20			43			27					57
SWD	10			23							3	
ELL	17			44							3	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			40			25				4	
HSP	21			53			36				5	52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	19			41			27				5	56

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	27	53	47	51	72	88	37					69
SWD	10	56	52	25	68	86	9					67
ELL	14	57		52	86		20					69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	49	46	52	73	89	30					
HSP	20	60		52	77		26					63
MUL				50								
PAC												
WHT	44	64		47	55							
FRL	25	52	47	51	72	88	33					67

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	24	55	72	38	81	94	30					46
SWD	4	50	69	22	77	92	8					
ELL	17			50								46

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	50	67	32	83	92	22					
HSP	21	60		40	79		33					41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53			61								
FRL	24	55	72	38	81	94	30					48

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	39%	53%	-14%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	21%	54%	-33%	58%	-37%
03	2023 - Spring	12%	46%	-34%	50%	-38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	55%	2%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	59%	-24%	61%	-26%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	53%	-21%	55%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	25%	47%	-22%	51%	-26%

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.

Our two data components that showed the lowest performance were both in literacy, specifically in the learning gains of our bottom quartile students. Upon further analysis, our third-grade bottom quartile students saw the lowest performance going from the 67th percentile in AP2 to 33rd percentile in AP3. Possible factors that could have contributed to this decline was the significant amount of third graders who began the school year reading below grade level from the previous year. New content benchmarks, coupled with newly adopted curriculum, as well as foundational skills gaps may have contributed to the low performance in literacy. Contributing factors include content knowledge of new benchmarks.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was in the area of science proficiency dropping from 37% proficient to 27% proficiency. Contributing factors include student transition due to 5th grade teacher leaving after first quarter. Teacher knowledge of science concepts taught including prerequisite skills.

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.

When comparing Kenly's PM 3 data against PM 3 state performance, our data component with the greatest gap was in the area of ELA. 12% of our third-grade students scored a level 3 or higher on PM 3 during the 22-23 school year. In comparison, the state average for third graders who scored a level 3 or higher on PM 3 was 50%, which accounts for a 38% difference. As previously mentioned, possible factors that would account for this gap was the disproportionate number of third graders who began the school year below grade level in reading.

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

We had equally significant improvement across three data components. In reviewing the K12 Lift reports, ELA learning gains in fifth grade went from the 50th percentile to the 64th percentile, while learning in gains in mathematics also improved in fifth grade, increasing from the 37th percentile to the 51st percentile. Additionally, our fourth-grade mathematics bottom quartile saw an increase from the 36th percentile to the 50th percentile. Each of these data components saw an improvement of 14%.

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

Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment

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

1. Increase proficiency in ELA. 2. Increase Proficiency in Mathematics. 3. Increase Proficiency in Science. 4. Increase student growth in the BQ in ELA and Math.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Utilize PBIS to support tier I behavior management and positively reward behaviors contributing to high academic achievement. Student behavior contributes to student academic success and teacher retention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease non bus suspensions by 15% by increasing positive behavior supports.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly PBIS Steering Committee will review student behavioral data including points rewarded for school wide expectations. School wide expectations are Respect, Responsibility, Owning actions, Trying our best.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

PBIS practices are the interventions and strategies that are evidence-based in achieving the valued or expected outcomes. Prevention practices include defining, teaching, modeling, monitoring and acknowledging expected behaviors as well as practices for responding to students' disruptive behaviors in class and non-classroom settings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Improve positive behavior and academic outcomes by decreasing tier 1 behaviors in all areas of the school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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

Grades K-2 will focus on Foundational Skills using Dibels, Flamingo, Magnetic Reading, Ufli and Wonders Foundational Skills to increase reading fluency and decoding based on components of the K-2 screener and IReady Diagnostic.

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

Grades 3-5 will focus on building fluency and decoding with specific students and focus on the presentation and delivery of effective reading practices based on F.A.S.T PM3 data and IReady diagnostics.

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

80% of our K-2 students will increase their foundational skills levels to proficiency using the components of the K-2 screener and increase their IReady percentile by 10% as measured by the Spring Diagnostic.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

80% of our 3-5 students will increase their percentage between the F.A.S.T PM1 to the F.A.S.T PM3 during the 2023-2024 school year.

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.

K-2 – K-2 will be monitored using the Beginning, Middle and End K-2 Foundational Skills Screener Components. We will use the I-Ready Diagnostics Fall, Winter and Spring to determine small groups and interventions needed. Instructional lessons from Wonders, Dibbles, IReady toolbox and BrainSpring for ESE students will be utilized.

3-5 – Grades 3-5 will be monitored using the Fall, Winter and Spring I-Ready Diagnostic and the PM1, PM2 and PM3 from the F.A.S.T. assessment. This will determine small group instruction and interventions needed. Instructional lessons will come from Magnetic Reading in I-Ready, IReady toolbox, Wonders, Dibbles, and BrainSpring for ESE Students.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Seiferd, Angela, angela.seiferd@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 - Ufli is a foundational skills program that is evidence based to teach phonemic awareness, phonics, and decoding skills to learners. Wonders foundational skill lessons also support teaching phonics and decoding skills. These programs align to our reading plan and align to the BEST ELA standards.

Additional support from BrainSpring for ESE lessons.

3-5 - Magnetic Reading in I-Ready supports the science of reading to students and is BEST standards aligned. I-Ready (lessons aligned to BEST), I-Ready toolbox, Wonders, Dibbles, Ufli and BrainSpring for ESE Students, will also be utilized in the planning of instruction for students.

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?

Many of these programs are purchased by the county and have shown that when students utilize the programs with validity, the students show growth over time. Dibels provides foundational and decoding skills for reading, while I-Ready and Wonders also has those components, these programs along with

Magnetic Reading support the comprehension in high interest, high quality lessons to increase reading fluency and comprehension to build up students reading levels.

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 coaching using the coaching side by side or coteach model will be used to address the instructional practices and delivery of instructional routines to meet the needs of learners. Planning sessions will be held to ensure that that lesson learning targets and objectives are planned for and student outcomes are targeted and met.	Seiferd, Angela, angela.seiferd@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.

Staff, Parents, and community members will receive a paper version of our monthly newsletter with links to a school based SWAY. The SWAY is modified monthly to provide important information including School Improvement information and links for parents to communicate with faculty and staff.

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))

We have continued to have a Back to School Bash to engage community members and give out backpacks and supplies to students attending Kenly. We have also scheduled a STEM night, Winter

Wonderland, end of the year carnival, open house, parent teacher conferences to support open communication with parents and families. All of this is communicated through our monthly newsletter, Monthly digital SWAY, parent links text messages, front of the school signage. In October 2023 we will open a client choice food pantry pilot program in conjunction with Feeding Tampa Bay and Feeding America called Feeding Minds.

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))

We will continue to strengthen academic progress by increasing academic time through ELP. Teachers from each grade level will participate in tutoring sessions to increase instructional time on critical concepts in ELA, Mathematics and science. We will also utilize PENDA science, Flocabulary, and Nearpod to increase student engagement, vocabulary, and prerequisite skills. Extended learning opportunities will offer extended learning opportunities beyond the school day.

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))

We currently have one HeadStart unit supporting early education. We have been approved for the fresh fruit and vegetable program through student nutrition. We will begin our client choice food pantry in October 2023. We also offer Head Start Program for students beginning at the age of 3. We partner with organizations such as SEEDS to provide resources for students and families. Our school has also engaged in the Healthy Fruits and Vegetables program. Students also receive free breakfast and lunch.

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))

Kenly reviews and supports mental health needs through a bi-weekly PSLT meeting that reviews students that need additional counseling or mental health services. In attendance we have Administration, School Counselor, School Social Worker, School Psychologist, and ESE Specialist.

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))

-