

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lopez 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	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lopez Elementary School

200 N KINGSWAY RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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 build strong relationships so ALL students become the best version of themselves.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To Center ALL Students.

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
Harris, Zemenaye	Principal	
Jolly, Vanity	Assistant Principal	
Jauch, Gina	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Piccorelli, Rachel	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Piccorelli, Kaitlyn	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Mestre, Tracey	SAC Member	
Padilla-Atiles, Vanessa	Parent Engagement Liaison	

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.

During the 22-23 school year, student data and teacher data was consistently analyzed with various leadership team such as ILT and SAC as well as our entire staff. Through the data analysis, each team worked together to develop our SIP along with our action steps.

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))

During the 23-24 school year, our leadership team: ILT and SAC will consistently monitor our SIP and action plan and our student and teacher data to ensure we are making progress.

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	65%
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: 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	27	33	19	26	19	18	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	18	19	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	18	22	0	0	0	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	22	20	38	0	0	0	0	0	97
	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	10	16	6	18	11	8	0	0	0	69

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	1	9	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	46	27	39	29	20	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	5
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	15	13	17	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	22	18	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	24	18	21	15	19	0	0	0	99

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	3	9	1	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	8	15	10	3	0	0	0	41
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	46	27	39	29	20	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	5
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	15	13	17	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	22	18	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	24	18	21	15	19	0	0	0	99

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	3	9	1	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	8	15	10	3	0	0	0	41
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*	49	50	53	46	53	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				63			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			57		
Math Achievement*	49	56	59	52	50	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				55			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			35		
Science Achievement*	47	50	54	34	59	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	59	59	69			60		

** 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
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	36	Yes	4	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	44			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	46			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	39	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	43			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	49			

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	49			49			47					61
SWD	40			34			33				5	36
ELL	29			46			38				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49			35			42				4	
HSP	37			48			44				5	61
MUL	56			56							2	
PAC												
WHT	57			54			50				4	
FRL	45			46			45				5	62

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	46	63	44	52	55	36	34					69
SWD	33	52	31	30	34	29	9					20
ELL	33	39		42	47	40	6					69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	62		47	45		21					
HSP	40	54	14	48	52	41	29					67
MUL	56			69								
PAC												
WHT	49	71	67	54	60	38	33					
FRL	44	59	43	50	55	41	32					69

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	49	53	57	50	44	35	37					60
SWD	36	53		40	47		33					
ELL	30	44		35	56		8					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	38		41	31		33					
HSP	40	48	40	43	56		25					55
MUL	69			69								
PAC												
WHT	52	65		57	39		48					
FRL	47	49	47	49	44	35	35					60

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	48%	53%	-5%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	54%	4%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	46%	-15%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	36%	55%	-19%	59%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	53%	-2%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	51%	-7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on our schoolwide progress monitoring and state assessment data from the 2022-2023 school year, our lowest performing components were our specific subgroups of students. In ELA, our English Language Learners earned an overall proficiency score of 3%, and in Math, our Students with Disabilities earned an overall proficiency score of 16%. Some of the factors contributing to the low performance of our English Language Learners in ELA are their limited time within the country (monolingual students), as well as limited layers of support due to a vacant position for a majority of the year. While teachers were equipped and worked hard to support learners within the classroom, providing those additional layers of support would positively impact our English Language Learners. Some of the factors contributing to the low performance of our Students with Disabilities in Math are the restrictions of the pull-out design model in place for the 2022-2023 school year. During the 60-minute block, students who were pulled out to work on individual goals were missing core components of the math block. In an attempt to remediate, student learning gaps grew.

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

Based on our schoolwide progress monitoring and state assessment data from the 2022-2023 school year, our most significant decline occurred in 3rd grade. In ELA, our 3rd grade proficiency dropped from 47.5% to 31%, a decline of 16.5 percentage points. In Math, our 3rd grade proficiency dropped from 43% to 36%, a decline of 7 percentage points. This is in contrast to other grade levels who either maintained or grew in the percentage of proficient students. While expectations remain high for our 3rd graders, we recognize that this group of learners completed their Kindergarten year during the start of the Covid pandemic and school shut down. These learners launched their 1st grade year in eLearning and many maintained that mode of instruction throughout. As they entered 2nd grade, students wore masks, which while well intentioned, significantly restricts the clear communication needed between teacher and student. During these years, absences were high due to quarantine policies. Despite the best efforts of our families, teachers, and district staff, our 2022-2023 3rd grade students received an educational base that was inconsistent and ineffective.

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.

In both ELA and Math, our 3rd grade students had the most significant gap in comparison to the state's 3rd grade proficiency which was at 50%. District proficiency in 3rd grade was just below the state at 46%, and our region's proficiency was at 43%. As stated in #2, our ELA 3rd grade proficiency was at 31% and our Math proficiency was at 36%. While this proficiency is very low, it is consistent with the 3rd grade proficiency scores of our neighboring elementary schools which have an average of 29% proficiency in 3rd grade ELA and 32% in 3rd grade Math. As stated above, Covid had a devastating impact on our community. While many households in communities across the district and state were able to maintain momentum during this period due to sufficient resources (books, manipulatives, access to technology) and already literacy rich environments, a large population of our learners in and around the Seffner community struggled due to limited English, working parents who were unable to support the eLearning environment, a lack of resources and appropriate access to technology, as well as basic literacy/numeracy skills in the home.

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

In ELA, 4th graders increased in proficiency by 11 percentage points from 47% to 58%. In Math, 5th graders increased in proficiency by 10 percentage points from 41% to 51%. In Science, 5th graders increased in proficiency by 10 percentage points from 34% to 44%. We implemented new structures like weekly planning sessions with site based and district coaches and Friday data chats in response to the unit assessment and quarterly monitoring tools. Teachers responded to the data by adjusting instructional groupings and by targeting specific benchmarks of need. These specific grade levels of teachers also worked to ensure student ownership over data, as well as holding an incredibly high expectation for student performance. As a result, students held themselves to a high level of both behavioral and academic expectation.

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

ELA Proficiency and Attendance Concerns

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

Positive Culture: To center ALL students by building strong relationships, so that ALL students become the best version of themselves.

Academic Ownership: Students talk and ask questions about each other's thinking to clarify or improve their understanding.

Rigorous Content: The teacher deliberately checks for understanding throughout the lesson and adapts the learning according to student understanding.

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 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.

Positive Culture: to center ALL students by building strong relationships so that ALL students become the best version of themselves.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Emotion Regulation will increase from 42% to 50% measured by Panorama Survey.

Monitoring:

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

Focused walk-through with data collection based on our priority look-fors. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Utilize our Fall and Spring Panorama Data to monitor the progress of Emotion Regulation.

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.)

Teachers will participate in Professional Development with our Student Services team on how to implement Second Step Lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the 2023 Panaroma Survey, 42% of all students in grades 4-5 feel they are able to regulate their emotion. This score was due to the lack of consistent instruction in resiliency, character, and life skills development.

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.

Student Services Team will model Second Step Lessons to staff

Staff will implement Second Step Lessons

Student Services Team will teach Second Step Lessons based on student needs

Administration will provide consistent feedback

Person Responsible: Vanity Jolly (vanity.jolly@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Academic Ownership: students talk and ask questions about each other's thinking, to clarify or improve their understanding.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In Math (K-2) Star proficiency will maintain 65% proficiency. In Math 3-5, FAST proficiency will increase to 55%.

Monitoring:

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

Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our ESSA subgroup SWD and ELL students based on our instructional priorities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vanity Jolly (vanity.jolly@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.)

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach aligned to BEST Standards as applicable so they can deliver on grade level instructions to students, plan for academic ownership, and purposeful checks for understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the 2023 Math FSA score for grades 3-5, 50% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (ESSA subgroup proficiency: 16% SWD and 28% ELL). This score was due to the lack of student participation in core instruction (with high levels of academic ownership), as well as frequent checks for understanding.

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.

Planning for discussion structures

Facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions with a focus on opportunities for discussion (think time, multiple entry points, open ended questions)

Monthly differentiated professional development targeting our SWD and ELL students

Job embedded coaching

Learning Walks (based on teacher need)

On-going feedback provided by administration

Data responsive professional learning communities (adjustment to support based on SWD & ELL student data and teacher trend especially)

Person Responsible: Gina Jauch (gina.jauch@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

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

Rigorous Content: the teacher deliberately checks for understanding throughout the lesson and adapts the learning according to student understanding.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In ELA (K-2) Star proficiency will increase from 52% to 55%. In ELA (3-5) FAST proficiency will increase from 48% to 55%.

In Math (K-2) Star proficiency will maintain 65% proficiency. In Math 3-5, FAST proficiency will increase to 55%.

Monitoring:

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

Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our ESSA subgroup SWD and ELL students based on our instructional priorities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Zemenaye Harris (zemenaye.harris@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.)

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach aligned to BEST Standards as applicable so they can deliver on grade level instructions to students, plan for academic ownership, and purposeful checks for understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the 2023 ELA Star scores, 52% of all students in grades K-2 scored at proficiency. This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards, academic ownership opportunities, and frequent checks for understanding.

Based on the 2023 ELA FSA scores, 48% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (ESSA subgroup proficiency: 3% ELL and 22% SWD). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards, academic ownership opportunities, and frequent checks for understanding.

Based on the 2023 Math FSA score for grades 3-5, 50% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (ESSA subgroup proficiency: 16% SWD and 28% ELL). This score was due to the lack of student participation in core instruction (with high levels of academic ownership), as well as frequent checks for understanding.

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.

Planning for discussion structures

Facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions with a focus on opportunities for discussion (think time, multiple entry points, open ended questions)

Monthly differentiated professional development targeting our SWD and ELL students

Job embedded coaching

Learning Walks (based on teacher need)

On-going feedback provided by administration

Data responsive professional learning communities (adjustment to support based on SWD & ELL student data and teacher trend especially)

Person Responsible: Rachel Piccorelli (rachel.piccorelli@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

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

Academic Ownership: students talk and ask questions about each other’s thinking, to clarify or improve their understanding.

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

Academic Ownership: students talk and ask questions about each other's thinking, to clarify or improve their understanding.

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

In ELA (K-2) Star proficiency will increase from 52% to 55%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In ELA (3-5) FAST proficiency will increase from 48% to 55%.

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.

Focused walk-through with data collection based on our instructional priorities look-fors. Administration will participate in planning sessions, data chats, and professional development. Continuation of progress monitoring, providing teachers feedback, and follow-up feedback. Monitor the progress of our ESSA subgroup SWD and ELL students based on our instructional priorities.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Harris, Zemenaye, zemenaye.harris@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?

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with an instructional coach aligned to BEST Standards as applicable so they can deliver on grade level instructions to students, plan for academic ownership, and purposeful checks for understanding.

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?

Based on the 2023 ELA Star scores, 52% of all students in grades K-2 scored at proficiency. This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards, academic ownership opportunities, and frequent checks for understanding.

Based on the 2023 ELA FSA scores, 48% of all students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (ESSA subgroup proficiency: 3% ELL and 22% SWD). This score was due to the lack of opportunities provided for students to be engaged in grade level standards, academic ownership opportunities, and frequent checks for understanding.

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
Planning for discussion structures	
Facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions with a focus on opportunities for discussion (think time, multiple entry points, open ended questions)	
Monthly differentiated professional development targeting our SWD and ELL students	
Job embedded coaching	Piccorelli, Rachel, rachel.piccorelli@sdhc.k12.fl.us
Learning Walks (based on teacher need)	
On-going feedback provided by administration	
Data responsive professional learning communities (adjustment to support based on SWD & ELL student data and teacher trend especially)	

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.

SIP will be shared with our families throughout the school year. Monthly School Advisory Council meetings, monthly Instructional Leadership meetings, quarterly family events, and consistently updated within our school website (<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/lopez>).

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))

Lopez Elementary will host two family nights to engage families in school activities and share resources. We will also host two conference nights to share students’ academic progress. In addition, families will receive monthly newsletters from each teacher that communicates the learning that is taking place. Lopez will also send monthly progress reports to families for students who are struggling academically and quarterly progress reports for those who are meeting grade level expectations. Calendar of Events 23-24.pdf ([hillsboroughschools.org](https://www.hillsboroughschools.org))

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)

Planning for progress monitoring and discussion structures

Facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions with a focus on opportunities for discussion (think time, multiple entry points, open ended questions) and checks for understanding (anecdotal notes, coding system)

Monthly differentiated professional development

Job embedded coaching

Learning Walks (based on teacher need)

On-going feedback provided by administration

Data responsive professional learning communities (adjustment to support based on student data and teacher trend)

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))

N/A