

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lomax Magnet 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	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lomax Magnet Elementary School

4207 N 26TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Lomax will build a community of active thinking and learning citizens through exploration, enrichment, electives and expeditions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Lomax community will develop the individual talents and strengths of each child.

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
Jacobsen Capps, Sarah	Principal	Principal
Fruchey, Jennifer	SAC Member	SAC Chair

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 process began in the Spring as we reviewed our area of focus and action steps through ILT and PLCs in alignment to data available at the time. Additionally, this process was presented during SIP meetings. During 1:1 teacher meetings, feedback was provided to administration related to teacher goal alignment to the plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Through our Axction Teams monthly to include ALT, ILT, PLCs and SAC.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	10	14	12	13	7	0	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	
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	20	16	19	0	0	0	55	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	23	17	0	0	0	55	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	28	14	16	19	0	0	0	94	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	9	5	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	9	10	5	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	10	14	12	13	7	0	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	
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	20	16	19	0	0	0	55	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	23	17	0	0	0	55	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	28	14	16	19	0	0	0	94	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	9	5	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	9	10	5	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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*	37	50	53	38	53	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				54			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			35		
Math Achievement*	30	56	59	38	50	50	29		
Math Learning Gains				69			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			11		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	35	50	54	34	59	59	27		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	59						

* 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	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	138
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	9	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	28	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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	34	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	44			

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	37			30			35					
SWD	4			13							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34			25			25				4	
HSP	50			58							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	32			26			23				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	38	54	38	38	69	60	34					
SWD	19	43	30	27	55		27					
ELL	58	70		50	91							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	53	40	36	67	64	33					
HSP	21	43		22	64		20					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34	49	31	35	65	61	30					

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	39	37	35	29	22	11	27					
SWD	20	36		12	9							
ELL	57			33								

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	35	38	36	23	21	13	26					
HSP	40			35								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33	34	35	22	20	11	24					

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	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	30%	54%	-24%	58%	-28%
03	2023 - Spring	30%	46%	-16%	50%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	34%	55%	-21%	59%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	26%	59%	-33%	61%	-35%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	47%	-11%	51%	-15%

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.

FAST 2023 Math 33%

-While we saw gains from PM1-PM3, we anticipated a greater number of students scoring at a Level 3 in 4th based on other data. In reflection, we wondered if students would benefit from more practice in CB questions and assessments.

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

Math- the % at a level 3 dropped the most in Math for FAST 2023.

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.

-

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

Science increased 2% at a Level 3 or higher. Actions included: weekly collaborative science planning with the DRT for Science; focus on students showing mastery following hands on Science activities; planning for extended learning that address missed standards in Nature of Science

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

% of students scoring at a Level 1.

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

- 1) Improve climate and culture for the purpose of student achievement through PBIS
- 2) Increase percent of students at proficiency in Reading, Writing, Math and Science

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.

Through an analysis conducted with the school PBIS team, we found a correlation between behavior incidences and our students scoring a level 1, including the subgroup SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students with disabilities (SWD) scoring a level 3 or higher on STAR/FAST will increase by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Data PLCs with VE and Gen Ed teachers serving students with disabilities will be held following progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@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.)

PBIS practices are evidence based. Implementation of the action steps will result in increased time on learning tasks for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A correlation between behaviors from teachers and students that support a strong learning environment and student achievement outcomes is well documented.

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.

Develop and implement PBIS plan with the PBIS Team

Person Responsible: Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

By When: September 30, 2023

Hold data chats with students to include targeted subgroup of SWD to include behaviors impacting achievement

Person Responsible: Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

By When: Chat 1: Sept 2023; Chat 2: January 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**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.

With changing standards, time for teachers to work together in deepen understanding of the benchmarks has been critical. In planning, teachers utilize BEST books and instructional guides to determine what students need to know and how they will show their learning across Reading, Writing, Math and Science. Additionally, planning for small group includes a focus on targeted subgroups of Students with Disabilities and Hispanic. The need for foundational skills instruction may be addressed for subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of instructional staff will participate in collaborative instructional planning weekly utilizing a schoolwide planning schedule.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will be scheduled into planning sessions, and check ins held with the ILT. Through walkthroughs, evidence of planning should be observed, and any needs will be brought back to the planning conversations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@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.)

Weekly collaborative planning sessions through a teacher approved school improvement waiver.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Developing teacher and student clarity (Hattie) is directly aligned with planning. In planning, teacher develop clarity on what students should know through analysis of benchmarks and clarifications.

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.

Schoolwide collaborative planning schedule will be created to include a backwards planning protocol. Content experts will be scheduled to support planning cycles.

Person Responsible: Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

By When: September 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

This area of focus is specifically related to the teaching of Reading in K-5. This focus is critical as we are an identified RAISE school based on the following grade levels with 50% of more of students scoring below the 40th%ile of STAR/FAST 2023: 3rd- 71% of students; 4th- 70% of students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Less than 50% of students will score below the 40th%ile in FAST Reading 2024 at all grade levels K-5. 41% of students in the subgroups SWD and Hispanic will score a Level 3 or higher on FAST Reading 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Continuous review of student progress monitoring data through PLCs and ALT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@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.)

In addition to collaborative planning and the work of action teams, ELA coaching cycles with grades 3-5 will be held with administration and district resource coaches for literacy. Ongoing support with our SRLD will be scheduled with a focus on these grades and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Coaching cycles allow the opportunity to see planning in action with a focus on what students are doing. Feedback and next steps ensure corrections are made in a timely manner.

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.

Weekly collaborative planning in ELA; Targeted support from DRTs and SRLD; Data PLCs for spotlight checkpoints and unit assessments

Person Responsible: Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing weekly in planning and instruction

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Teachers continue to put great effort into building understanding of the benchmarks and related student data. They plan for student understanding of the learning target, and related success criteria. Walkthrough and observation data supports that despite this often the workload in a lesson may fall more on the teacher (teacher talk versus student opportunity for practice). Due to this, as a school, we are committed to increasing student engagement and ownership of learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 80% of classrooms, based on walkthrough lookfor data, students are able to share how they know they are successful and provide reflection and feedback on where they are in the learning process of the lesson by February 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Planning: Ensure planning for ownership occurs

Student Data Chats- Planned with ILT, scheduled by Admin

Monthly walkthroughs with specific lookfors

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@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.)

- Develop clear success criteria in planning and how you will ensure students understand this criteria
- In walkthroughs, ask students: what are you learning, how do you know when you are successful (look for rubrics, criteria, evidence of feedback)
- Schedule schoolwide student data chat days following PM 1 & 2
- Teachers self monitor release to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie- If students have clarity and are able to predict their success, they will be more successful.

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.

Development and implementation of success criteria to include how students will use this criteria to predict how they will do and self monitor progress in the lesson.

Person Responsible: Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing in planning and instruction 9/23-5/24

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)).

Lomas has been identified as ATSI for the subgroups SWD and Hispanic. Through our way of work, these specific subgroups will be monitored and additional supports provided to students through tutoring with Title 1 dollars. ESE and Gen Ed teachers will plan together and subgroups specific PLC data chats will be held with teachers and targeted students.

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

The instructional practice Area of Focus directly related to reading includes:

Collaborative planning weekly to include Admin
Implementation of UFLI with fidelity
Admin schedule ELA blocks
Walkthroughs with feedback for fidelity checks

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

The instructional practice Area of Focus related to reading includes:

Collaborative Planning
Flamingo small group structure in 3rd
Student ownership of the learning
Planning, Coaching and PD cycles with our assigned SRLD

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

60% or greater of K-2 students will score above the 40th percentile on FAST Reading 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% or greater of 3-5 students will score above the 40th percentile on FAST Reading 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.

School literacy team will review the data following student progress monitoring assessment to determine next steps related to coaching cycles, planning, and extended learning for students.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jacobsen Capps, Sarah, sarah.jacobsencapps@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?

Based on learning from the Science of Reading, we will implement UFLI in Grades K-2. Additionally, at all grade levels, benchmark aligned lessons that provide student opportunities to practice reading and responding to specifically chosen text will be developed through collaborative planning.

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?

K-2 Need for a systematic phonics instruction program; K-5 need for strong, benchmark aligned core reading instruction and targeted small groups

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
Through support from DRTs for Literacy and our SRLD, literacy coaching cycles will be provided in alignment with targeted needs (i.e. UFLI in K-2, student practice in 3-5).	Jacobsen Capps, Sarah, sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The SIP will be communicated in the following ways:
Posted to hillsboroughschools.org/Lomax
Sent directly to all SAC members
Shared at the Title 1 Parent Meeting on September 14th

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))

Relationships will be built through ongoing communications from the school and the teacher. This was trained as a priority during grade level PLCs in preplanning, with every grade level and teacher indicating how they will communicate with parents and involve them in instruction. Monthly parent and family events are schedule as a school and in collaboration with the PTA. This plan is made available on hillsboroughschools.org/Lomax

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)

Instructional minute schedules were created by administration for every teacher to ensure bell to bell instruction and proper minutes for each instructional area. Additionally, instructional time is protected as a culture at the school. Our Area of Focus includes student ownership. These action steps naturally build opportunities for enrichment, as well as through our Magnet curriculum. Additionally, our Title 1 dollars allow for an Rtl Resource Teacher who plans with teachers, helps with the problem solving process to determine small group needs, and supports targeted students directly. These funds are utilized in direct alignments with our SIP areas of focus and action steps.

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))

When develeoping the plan, the team considers any resources or services currently implemented or available. Our free breakfast and lunch program allows us to meet student basic needs and get students into the classroom earlier through the school duty waiver so they are ready to begin instruction at the first bell.