Mango Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mango Elementary School

4220 HWY 579, 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.

Every student will believe, achieve, and succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Every student will reach their highest potential.

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
Parke, Kimberly	Principal	*Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high-quality instruction practices utilizing the RTI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels. *Support the implementation of high-quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment. *Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. *Communicate schoolwide data to PLC and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. *Manage the daily operations of the school. *Provide instructional leadership to achieve the goals outlined in the School Improvement Plan. *Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff, reviews of teachers' activities, and issuance of directives. *Administers and develops educational programs for students with mental or physical disabilities. *Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school. *Establishes and maintains relationships with colleges, community organizations, and other schools to coordinate educational services. *Requisitions and allocates supplies, equipment, and instructional material as needed. *Directs preparation of class schedules, cumulative records, and attendance reports. *Walks about school building and property to monitor safety and security. *Plans and monitors school budget. *Plans for and directs building maintenance. *Performs any other duties as assigned. *Responsibilities and tasks outlined in this document are not exhaustive and may change as determined by the needs of the district.
Lyons, Marvilyn	Assistant Principal	*Makes or shares in the making of decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so that actions may be taken, and commitments made by self and others. *Acts in accordance with the shared vision and mission of the district and school; cares about the organization's reputation and is aware of the effect his/her decisions make on the organization. *Influences the school stakeholders by a variety of means, such as persuasive argument, setting examples, or using expertise; is able to present ideas to others in an open, informative, and non-evaluative manner; is able to write clearly and concisely. *Uses data to implement curriculum and instructional supervision; gathers, analyzes and uses data from varied and multiple sources to build relationships, form concepts, and create hypotheses;

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		analyzes alternatives and perspectives when solving a problem or making a decision. *Demonstrates readiness to initiate action and takes responsibility for leading and enabling others to improve the circumstances being faced or anticipated. *Organizes cooperatively with staff and other stakeholders to design and implement ways to reach the goals and mission of the school. *Skillfully facilitates others working together effectively; shows concern for diverse perspectives, as well as empathy for other's feelings; is adaptable. Discovers, understands, verbalizes accurately, and responds empathetically to perspectives, thoughts, ideas, and feelings of others. *Leads by example, setting goals that encourage self and others to reach higher standards. *Holds high and positive expectations for the growth and development of all stakeholders, including self. *Performs any other duties as assigned.
Walrath, Jessica	Reading Coach	*Work with educators to identify issues with students or curriculum, set goals, and solve problems. *Collaborate and lead common planning with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans. *Attend professional development workshops. *Help teachers conduct student assessments and analyze student work and lead data PLC's monthly. *Conference with students to help them discover their strengths and to set goals. *Interpret data after student or teacher assessments have been conducted weekly, monthly, and quarterly. *Design and lead professional development presentations for educators. *Model and coteach lessons to help educators learn.
Lee, Kayla	Teacher, K-12	*Work with educators to identify issues with students or curriculum, set goals, and solve problems. *Collaborate and lead common planning with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans. *Attend professional development workshops. *Help teachers conduct student assessments and analyze student work and lead data PLC's monthly. *Conference with students to help them discover their strengths and to set goals. *Interpret data after student or teacher assessments have been conducted weekly, monthly, and quarterly. *Design and lead professional development presentations for educators. *Model and coteach lessons to help educators learn. *Plan and facilitate SAC meetings. Submit required documentation as needed.

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 for involving stakeholders including the leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students, families and community partners involved surveying and discussing the needs of Mango Elementary School. Student data from the FAST PM 3 assessments and other data collected from parent and staff surveys was used to develop the SIP plan and guide these conversations to create a plan that accurately targets the academic, social, and cultural needs of students. The Assistant Principal (Marvilyn Lyons), Reading Coach (Jessica Lyons) and Teacher Leader (Kayla Lee) collaborated together to review and analyze school data from PM 3 iReady and FAST to determine the greatest needs of the school and which needs would have the greatest impact on student achievement. Stakeholders and the leadership team used this to determine a plan for improvement and action steps to successfully lead Mango to meet its goals which align with our school's mission and vision. Action steps will directly impact and focus on all students in the areas of reading and mathematics including students with the greatest achievement gap.

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students through weekly critical team's meetings involving all staff members including grade level content PLC's, Kid Talk sessions, action teams, and leadership meetings. It will also be monitored during monthly grade level data PLC's analyzing current student assessments and at SAC meetings which will focus on school-wide data, family and community engagement, and classroom data aligned with the school's instructional priorities. We will revise the plan, as necessary, when student data and achievement fall below the school wide targets.

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	84%
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: D 2018-19: D 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	98	94	85	73	73	58	0	0	0	481
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	8	7	6	0	0	0	25
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	51	38	42	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	54	46	45	0	0	0	145
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	51	38	42	0	0	0	131

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	2	2	25	18	12	0	0	0	59

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	56	101	82	105	79	31	0	0	0	454
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
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	99	67	82	0	0	0	248
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	87	54	90	0	0	0	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	23	14	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	16	1	0	0	0	0	20
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	56	101	82	105	79	31	0	0	0	454
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
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	99	67	82	0	0	0	248
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	87	54	90	0	0	0	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	23	14	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	16	1	0	0	0	0	20
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*	27	50	53	34	53	56	31		
ELA Learning Gains				57			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			59		
Math Achievement*	28	56	59	42	50	50	33		
Math Learning Gains				64			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			50		
Science Achievement*	22	50	54	33	59	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	59	59	56			54		

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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	159
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
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	4	1
ELL	26	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	1	1
HSP	32	Yes	1	
MUL	33	Yes	1	
PAC				

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%
WHT	22	Yes	1	1
FRL	29	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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	51			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	51			

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	27			28			22					55
SWD	8			20			0				5	40
ELL	18			27			19				5	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			26			20				4	
HSP	27			27			22				5	55

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
MUL	33			33							2	
PAC												
WHT	22			29			15				4	
FRL	24			25			21				5	53

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	34	57	65	42	64	58	33					56
SWD	9	40	59	26	41	57	6					42
ELL	27	55	58	45	59	47	19					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	57	56	36	61	69	32					
HSP	33	57	64	45	65	52	36					55
MUL	31			58								
PAC												
WHT	30	52		40	60		32					
FRL	34	56	65	40	62	61	32					54

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	31	49	59	33	39	50	33					54
SWD	14	35	42	21	47	42	29					40
ELL	22	67		24	59		23					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	48	55	33	36	27	33					
HSP	24	43	58	26	39	54	23					55
MUL	42			50								
PAC												
WHT	42	54		45	41		50					

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
FRL	30	48	58	32	41	52	32					55

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	32%	53%	-21%	54%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	28%	54%	-26%	58%	-30%
03	2023 - Spring	26%	46%	-20%	50%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	21%	55%	-34%	59%	-38%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	59%	-23%	61%	-25%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	19%	47%	-28%	51%	-32%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in the area of ELA for grades 3-5 on the FAST PM3 state assessment. On the 2021-22 FSA state assessment for grades 3-5, the proficiency in ELA was 33%. On the 2022-23 FAST PM3 state assessment for grades 3-5, the proficiency in ELA was 29%. This is a 5% drop in proficiency in ELA. Factors that may have contributed to this decline are the change from a paper and pencil test to a computerized test; change in question types and level of difficulty on the assessment; change in student text coding and note-taking while reading; change in Florida state benchmarks; change in the number of highly effective teachers due to school-wide vacancies. Trends from the PM1 through PM3 FAST state assessment show that most students did show adequate growth by moving from one level to the next; however, of those students who did increase from one level to the next, they made this consistent growth from PM1 through PM3.

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 from the prior year was in the area of Math for grades 3-5 on the FAST PM3 state assessment. On the 2021-22 FSA state assessment for grades 3-5, the proficiency in Math was 42%. On the FAST PM3 state assessment for grades 3-5, the proficiency in Math was 31%. This is an 11% drop in proficiency in Math. Factors that may have contributed to this decline are the change from a paper and pencil test to a computerized test; change in question types and level of difficulty on the assessment; change in the Florida state benchmarks; change in the number of highly effective teachers due to school-wide vacancies. Trends from the PM1 through PM3 FAST state assessment show that most students did show adequate growth by moving from one level to the next; however, of those students who did increase from one level to the next, they made this consistent growth from PM1 through PM3.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in the area of ELA for grades 3-5. The state average was 50% proficiency, while Mango averaged 29% proficiency. Factors that likely contributed to this is a large percentage of students at Mango who are below grade level and have achievement gaps in the area of ELA. Core instruction in the content area of reading is not consistently meeting the specific needs of each student at a rigorous instructional level. Targeted small group instruction is not being planned or provided consistently during the ELA block in order to meet the differentiated needs of individual students. The science of reading has not been explicitly taught to students in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary and oral language in order to meet the core reading needs of students.

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

Because the state assessment for the 2022-23 school year was a new, baseline assessment. We are awaiting further data and information about final scores and percentages. In addition, because this is a baseline assessment, students will only receive a proficiency score with no calculated student gains.

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

One particular area of concern is the shift from a paper and pencil test to a computerized assessment for the students. The students have to learn to scroll on the computer to see all of the text and then to go back and forth to answer the questions. The students also have to become familiar with the tools for highlighting and coding the text while reading. Another area of concern is shifting to the new BEST standards for instruction. The benchmarks use new vocabulary and question types on the assessments. Teachers are learning the new curriculum which aligns to the new standards.

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

1. Increase proficiency in ELA on FAST PM3 for grades 3-5 particularly for 3rd grade which will be a new data cell for calculating school grade.
2. Increase proficiency in Math on FAST PM3 for grades 3-5.
3. Increase proficiency in Science on the State assessment for grade 5.
4. Increase phonics and science instruction in all grades, particularly in K-2 using UFLI curriculum.
5. Increase school-wide culture and student behavior and engagement.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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

Area of Focus #1: Employ high leverage instructional practices/structures that allow all students to master the grade level benchmarks through Small Group Instruction in Reading, Math and Science.
(Hattie's Effect Size: .47)

Small group instruction (SGI) was identified as a crucial need from our school's data because SGI provides opportunities to meet students where they are in order to remediate or accelerate using grade-level, rigorous content aligned with the BEST standards. Small groups help to ensure that all students are receiving equitable instruction at an appropriate pace with clarity and repetition as needed. Small groups will be planned using carefully analyzed data so that students are guided at their instructional level throughout the lesson. SGI also provides more opportunities for students to do the thinking and engage in discourse during the instruction. SGI within the content areas of Reading, Math and Science is most powerful when it is used to deliver instruction for the specific needs of the learner. Although we may think of SGI as a remedial tool used for struggling students, when scaffolding to mastery of a standard, it is also the way to accelerate, extend and enrich learning. Both whole group and small group instruction will be focused on the science of reading strategies and methods for the 2023-24 school year.

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

45% of students in grades K-5 will be proficient in reading and math based on the iReady Diagnostic #3. 45% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in reading and math on the 2023-24 FAST PM3 given at the end of the school year.

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

During monthly data chats, walk-through data and common assessments will be reviewed to monitor trends and correlations between content presented during small group instruction and student growth. The leadership team will create/use a checklist of targeted students within small groups to monitor the effectiveness of the small group. Administration will conduct consistent walk-throughs, follow-ups, and data collection to ensure implementation of small groups and student growth and communicate trends to individual teachers and staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Kimberly Parke (kimberly.parke@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.)

Flexible, targeted small groups to support the transfer of learning (Hattie's Effect Size: .47). As a response to intervention, small group instruction gives the teacher an opportunity to evaluate and assess more closely what each student can do and build strategic plans around those assessments.

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

According to Visible Learning for Literacy, Grades K-12: Implementing the Practices that Work Best to Accelerate Student Learning from Fisher and Frey, student-centered teaching, basing instructional actions

on students' understanding and engaging students in flexible small group learning as an effect size of 0.47.

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.

Reading Coach, Teacher Leaders, and Assistant Principal will provide planning support in grades K-5, push in for core instruction focused on differentiated support for the lowest ESSA sub-group (once data is available), lead differentiation for small groups in planning for students in Tier 2 and 3 and weekly MTSS meetings, and lead data dives focused on common weekly assessments, diagnostics, and monthly/quarterly assessments. A daily schedule will be approved and monitored by administration on a weekly basis. Reading Coach and admin will develop planning protocols to be completed during collaborative planning sessions with grade levels each week. Walk-throughs and classroom observations will be used for monitoring.

Person Responsible: Jessica Walrath (jessica.walrath@hcps.net)

By When: The state FAST PM3 final assessment window in May 2024 for ELA and Math

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

School staff, students, parents and the community will work together to empower students to become leaders and decision makers by fostering a growth mindset, self-efficacy, and teacher-student relationships.

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

Teacher use of behavior tracker for student behaviors will decrease by 25% by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

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

Assistant Principal, School Counselor, and Behavior Specialists will monitor use of PBIS app by classroom teachers and analyze data reports. Behavior Tracker data will also be monitored weekly to track trends in behaviors that occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marvilyn Lyons (marvilyn.lyons@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.)

John Hattie, author of Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement, found that the teacher-student relationship had a .72 effect size on student achievement (FYI – an effect size of .4 and above is highly significant for student achievement). The research showed that the following teacher skills developed stronger relationships: listening skills, empathy, mutual respect, caring and positive regard for the students.

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

A positive school culture and environment reflects a supportive and fulfilling setting and learning conditions that meet the needs of all students. High student achievement needs a positive learning culture. Positive learning cultures encompass strong relationships built on trust and care among the teachers and students. Positive relationships among teachers and students are a vital piece in a high-poverty school since poverty can stunt the growth of healthy relationships. Promoting a growth mindset and self-efficacy by teachers, behavior specialists, administration, and community resource liaison will model the model for all students and build powerful and supportive teacher-student relationships.

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.

1. Behavior specialists will model and coach classroom teachers on effective behavior management strategies.
2. School counselor and assistant principal will monitor and track data from behavior tracker and PBIS app.
3. Monthly PBIS incentives will be provided for students.

Person Responsible: Marvilyn Lyons (marvilyn.lyons@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly beginning in September through May 2024

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

Small group instruction (SGI) within the content area of Reading/ELA is most powerful when it is used to deliver instruction for the specific needs of the learner. Although we may think of SGI as a remedial tool used for struggling students, when scaffolding to mastery of a standard, it is also the way to accelerate, extend, and enrich learning.

Small group instruction (SGI) allows teachers to ensure students have an equitable learning experience and can be just as successful as their peers in the educational setting. It provides the opportunity for all students to learn content at a pace and level they understand. The science of reading practices of phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and oral language will be taught during whole group and small group settings to increase reading proficiency of students who are scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

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

Small group instruction (SGI) within the content area of Reading/ELA is most powerful when it is used to deliver instruction for the specific needs of the learner. Although we may think of SGI as a remedial tool used for struggling students, when scaffolding to mastery of a standard, it is also the way to accelerate, extend, and enrich learning.

Small group instruction (SGI) allows teachers to ensure students have an equitable learning experience and can be just as successful as their peers in the educational setting. It provides the opportunity for all students to learn content at a pace and level they understand. The science of reading practices of

phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and oral language will be taught during whole group and small group settings to increase reading proficiency of students who are scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

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

2022-23 iReady Diagnostic 3 data evidenced that 38% of students in grades K-5 were proficient in reading. 2021-22 FSA data evidenced that 33% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in reading. 57% of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on FSA ELA. These school-wide averages fall below District and State averages. This evidences a need for planned, targeted small groups that address individual student learning needs.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

2022-23 iReady Diagnostic 3 data evidenced that 38% of students in grades K-5 were proficient in reading. 2021-22 FSA data evidenced that 33% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in reading. 57% of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on FSA ELA. These school-wide averages fall below District and State averages. This evidences a need for planned, targeted small groups that address individual student learning needs.

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.

Monthly PLC data chats with administration and leadership team will be held. Teachers will identify 45% of their current classroom students who will be proficient (in alignment with our school's goal of 45%) on the final FAST Progress Monitoring #3. During data PLC's and collaborative planning sessions, administration and academic coaches will support teachers in analyzing data from common assessments, planning re-teach lessons, and re-assessing student learning (response to intervention strategy). Weekly classroom walk-throughs and monitoring of small group instruction will take place between monthly PLC sessions.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Parke, Kimberly, kimberly.parke@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?

According to the Institute of Education Sciences (U.S. Department of Education), all students must be provided with solid, core instruction and struggling students must be provided with supplemental instructional opportunities in small groups based on their needs. The panel from the Institute of Education Sciences assigned moderate evidence rating for the evidence-based practice of small group instruction. Small groups align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive-based reading plan because supplemental small group instruction includes foundational skills, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension which are aligned to the BEST ELA benchmarks.

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?

Small groups address the identified need of increasing ELA proficiency to 45 % for all students and ESSA subgroups, including Students with Disabilities. Various curriculums and literacy and language skills will be addressed including foundational skills, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills. Small group instruction that includes explicit instruction, science of reading strategies, and scaffolding has a proven record of effectiveness for all ESSA subgroups, particularly the identified population of Students with Disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

  ◦ Literacy Leadership

  ◦ Literacy Coaching

  ◦ Assessment

  ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. Literacy Leadership: Reading Coach will lead collaborative planning sessions. Teacher leaders will provide model classrooms for other teachers to observe effective small group instruction in action. 2. Literacy Coaching: Reading Coach will engage in coaching sessions with classroom teachers focused on effective and targeted small group instruction. Admin will provide feedback during observations and student engagement. 3. Assessment: Teachers will use common formative assessments which will be sorted and analyzed during weekly planning sessions. Monthly and quarterly data PLC's will be deep dives of student progress towards goals with a specific focus on the identified 45% from each classroom. 4. Professional Learning: Weekly content PLC's will focus on job-embedded learning by teachers modeling the "how" they will explicitly teach content. Staff will be provided with small group professional development from district coaches which focuses on the importance and the "why" of small groups in all content areas.	Parke, Kimberly, kimberly.parke@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 plan will be available on our school's district website. Here is the link: https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/Page/257. The SIP plan will also be copied and provided to each member of the School Advisory Committee at the first meeting on August 24, 2023. The SIP plan will also be posted on our school's Mango Teams page for all staff to view.

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))

Mango Elementary plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support needs of students, and keep parents informed of their child's progress through meaningful communication by using Parent links, principal's monthly newsletter, quarterly conference nights, homeroom teacher communications via apps, phone calls, and written notes. Parent and family engagement materials including student communication planners for grades K-5 will be used to help students with organizational skills and as a daily communication tool between the classroom teacher and families.

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))

Mango Elementary will strengthen its academic program by hiring a reading and math coach to facilitate teachers through collaborative planning, coaching, modeling of lessons, and coteaching. Two teacher leaders will also be hired in 5th grade to implement a model classroom in the areas of reading, math and science. Teacher leaders will lead the 5th grade team in planning and will model highly effective lessons for the 5th grade team. Support from teacher leaders will also include co-teaching, working with small groups and analyzing student data on key assessments. Two behavior specialists will be hired to support primary and intermediate classrooms through coaching of teachers on behavior management strategies, working with small groups of tier 3 behavior concerns, modeling character education lessons, and increasing school culture through relationship building. Teachers will have one hour of common, collaborative planning each week with an academic coach and one hour of team planning and preparation for lessons on their own. Weekly walkthroughs by administration will be focused on the area of focus of small group instruction. As teachers progress and grow with small group instruction, walk-throughs will focus on student discourse, specifically, student discussion which increases student understanding of the content they are learning.

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

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))

Classroom teachers provide daily lessons in Second Step curriculum to promote character, resilience, and life skills. The school counselor provides quarterly lessons in classrooms focused on mental health services.

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))

Mango is an AVID elementary school which focuses on opportunities for college and career readiness in the elementary school setting.

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).

Mango is a PBIS school which uses school-wide expectations to provide consistency and structure for students as well as positive reinforcement for on-task behaviors. Students are tiered using the district

behavior tracker system and strategies are implemented depending on the tier in order to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services.

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))

Teachers and academic coaches engage in professional and job-embedded learning during monthly data PLC sessions in which current formative assessments are analyzed and strategies are discussed in a collaborative setting. Mango uses a school-wide digital data wall to track academic assessments and plan instruction accordingly.

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))

Mango has two Head Start units to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education to the kindergarten classroom. Each classroom has an assistant who also works with students to support and prepare students for the elementary school setting.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No