

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Mintz Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>23</b>

## Mintz Elementary School

1510 HEATHER LAKES BLVD, Brandon, FL 33511

[ 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.**

Mintz Elementary's mission is to give each student the opportunity to learn according to his or her ability and to create a school that is attentive to the emotional needs of every student.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Mintz will build relationships in a safe and supportive environment to create a community of engaged learners and leaders.

## 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
Martin, Kevin	Principal	The instructional leader of the school responsible for engaging all stakeholders as well as collaboration with all stakeholders.
Simmons, Precious	Assistant Principal	Assisting the principal as the instructional leader of the school responsible for engaging all stakeholders as well as collaboration with all stakeholders.
Miranda, Enid	ELL Compliance Specialist	SAC Chair, responsible for managing all matters related to ELL students.
Wilhelmsen, Jessica	Reading Coach	Responsible for helping to improve literacy instruction.
Jenkins, Stacy	Math Coach	Responsible for helping to improve math instruction.
Rutkowski, Jessica	Science Coach	Responsible for helping to improve science instruction.

**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 SIP plan was developed with our academic literacy, math and science resource teachers. The plans are based on the previous year's data and where the team has determined the biggest impacts that can

be made. The plan will be reviewed the faculty as a whole for comment as well as our School Advisory Council.

**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))

Regular weekly meetings are scheduled for admin to meet with the resource teachers, evaluation of the plan will be a topic. The SAC will also meet monthly for a report on our progress for oversight as well as feedback on the direction we are going.

**Demographic Data**  
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	82%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	34	49	35	27	28	29	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	47	49	0	0	0	96
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	35	39	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	38	48	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	40	40	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	20	13	18	40	0	0	0	108
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**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	3	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	35	26	23	27	24	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	51	38	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	44	28	0	0	0	105
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	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	14

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	15
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	35	26	23	27	24	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	51	38	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	44	28	0	0	0	105
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	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	14

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	15
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*	33	50	53	41	53	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				46			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			48		
Math Achievement*	43	56	59	50	50	50	44		
Math Learning Gains				69			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			22		
Science Achievement*	31	50	54	32	59	59	34		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	81	59	59	73			53		

\* 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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	229
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	42			

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	32	Yes	2	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	53			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	46			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			43			31					81
SWD	14			18			7				5	73
ELL	26			36			38				5	81
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			35			32				4	
HSP	24			37			26				5	79
MUL	50			57			45				3	
PAC												
WHT	48			56			20				4	
FRL	28			40			27				5	78

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	41	46	41	50	69	49	32					73
SWD	14	26	21	24	51	38	9					73
ELL	41	57	50	41	69		25					73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	41	45	43	59	46	19					
HSP	43	50	35	45	72	57	38					81
MUL	43	47		59	87							
PAC												
WHT	44	47		69	77		38					
FRL	37	42	40	45	67	48	22					70

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	47	38	48	44	29	22	34					53
SWD	24	33		24	17		30					
ELL	38	38		43	54		14					53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	17		39	38		44					
HSP	50	44		45	25	10	22					50
MUL	57			65								
PAC												
WHT	52	52		44	29		30					
FRL	42	36	48	40	28	20	27					50

**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	30%	53%	-23%	54%	-24%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	54%	-23%	58%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	46%	-7%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	55%	-8%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	61%	-18%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	30%	47%	-17%	51%	-21%

### 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.**

ELA proficiency scores dropped 7% from 41% to 34%, learning gains in the previous year were 46%, learning movement this year was 49%. Math proficiency scores dropped 6% from 50% to 44%, learning gains the previous year were 69%, learning movement this year was 63%. Science proficiency dropped 2%, from 32% to 30%. Students with disabilities present a significant gap when compared to the total number of students and the various other sub groups at our school with all but one category being a 20% plus difference. Mintz went through numerous staffing issues during the year as well as a change in overall leadership. Attendance and tardy sign in also contribute to the lagging scores.

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

ELA proficiency was the greatest decline. Mintz was to have a reading coach to assist with our literacy efforts, however in the end this position was not filled for the 2022-2023 school year and we struggled with getting the needed supports to the teachers.

**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.**

n/a

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

Math proficiency increased by 6%. New actions included a full time math coach and a focus on standards based instruction driven by monthly data.

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

Attendance is a primary area of concern. As a school, Mintz's attendance rate was 92.6% with 96%+ being the goal. This would mean a decrease of 4,600 student days missed. Nearly 57% of our students did not meet the goal attendance and 52% were chronically absent with 10 or more absences.

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

1. Improving attendance rates and decreasing the number of tardy sign ins.
2. Focusing on the needs of each student in the core academic areas.
3. Improving outcomes for our ESSA SWD sub-group.

**Area of Focus**

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

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

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Mintz will work to create an even more positive culture and environment for students and staff as a means to increase student attendance percentage as well as to decrease the number of chronically absent students and decrease the number of tardy sign ins.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Mintz will increase our school wide attendance percentage from 92.6% to 96% by May 2024.

### Monitoring:

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

Attendance rates for homerooms will be calculated every month of school and tracked to stay on target. Weekly reports will be monitored by the school social worker.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynelle Frasher (201775@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.)

Students will earn points through the Live School Tier 1 positive behavior management system for attending school each day and on time.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There are multiple studies that show that by simply improving student attendance rates improves student academic success rates as well as high school graduation rates.

### 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.

Attendance rates will be monitored and parents will receive letters indicating when a student is approaching or has exceeded the chronic absence threshold of 15 days per semester.

**Person Responsible:** Lynelle Frasher (201775@hcps.net)

**By When:** This will be done on an ongoing basis with every 20 school days being used as a benchmark as well as weekly homeroom attendance reports.



## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Mintz needs to increase student proficiency all in core academic areas. To do so, we need to put strategies in place that allow each student to reach proficiency of essential benchmarks at their grade level.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Mintz will increase proficiency in core academic areas as measured by the May FSA, literacy from 41% to 50%, math from 50% to 55%, science from 30% to 45%.

### Monitoring:

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

We will utilize beginning-of-the-year Data as measured by Dibels, FAST, Star, and I-Ready to create a triangulation of needs and strengths. Teams will meet weekly to drive collaboration and development of small-group interventions, i-ready interventions, and weekly grade-level teams' standards-based lesson planning.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Wilhelmsen (jessica.wilhelmsen@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.)

Mintz will embed AVID strategies using WICOR daily in conjunction with the Science of Reading and Writing research to provide engaging Standards Based lessons that target the six overarching expectations of the B.E.S.T Standards. These practices will work to close the achievement gaps in order to obtain proficiency growth in all tiered levels of Reading.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AVID brings a focus to student learning through WICOR strategies. Research shows that these strategies when used effectively and consistently create rigor for each student and improve academic outcomes.

### 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.

Bi-weekly collaborative planning with grade levels with a focus on standard based instruction. The meeting will focus on developing a framework around the student end task that is aligned to the guiding question, unit question and focus benchmark/standard and analyzing student data on instructional task to determine student progress towards learning outcomes, mastery of grade level standards/benchmarks and what misconceptions students are demonstrating that is keeping them from achieving proficiency.

**Person Responsible:** Stacy Jenkins (stacy.jenkins@hcps.net)

**By When:** Quarterly grade level PLC to discuss data from QMT (Quarterly Monitoring Tool) to determine grade level/class trends and develop next steps to be implemented for student achievement.

Implement coaching cycles around teacher clarity if the guiding question and its relationship to the daily learning target. Weekly and bi-weekly collaborative planning with grade levels with a focus on standard based instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Rutkowski (jessica.rutkowski@hcps.net)

**By When:** Utilize Form and Quarterly assessments grade level Data chats in PLC to determine grade and class level trends and develop next steps.

### **CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

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

## **Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

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

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

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

Mintz teachers will teach the BEST Standards using the Florida Literacy instruction Profile. The profile will be used in the course of PLC meetings as a point of emphasis and then using the school leader's literacy walkthrough tool to provide feedback and professional development specific to the needs of teachers.

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

Mintz teachers will teach the BEST Standards using the Florida Literacy instruction Profile. The profile will be used in the course of PLC meetings as a point of emphasis and then using the school leader's

literacy walkthrough tool to provide feedback and professional development specific to the needs of teachers.

### **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**

On the 2022-2023 i-ready diagnostic 3, 79% of our current 1st grade students were on grade level.  
On the 2022-2023 i-ready diagnostic 3, 59% of our current 2nd grade students were on grade level.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

On the i-ready diagnostic 3, 61% of our current 3rd graders were proficient.  
On the 2022-2023 PM3 FAST, 39% of our current 4th graders were proficient earning a level 3 or better, this will increase to 50% on the 2023-2024 PM3 FAST.  
On the 2022-2023 PM3 FAST, 31% of our current 5th graders were proficient earning a level 3 or better, this will increase to 50% on the 2023-2024 PM3 FAST.

### **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.

Using the walk-through data with Leadership teams and coaches to monitor implementation and needs.  
PLC;s  
Data Trackers

#### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@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?

UFLI (k-2) and Go95 (3rd-5th) will be used to target explicit phonics instruction and monitor student automaticity in decoding and encoding skills connected to the Science of Reading. BEST standards tracking utilizing student data trackers, IREADY teacher interventions with Standard based reporting will be reviewed Monthly in PLC's to drive whole group and small group implementation. Progress monitoring through DIBELS will evaluate what impact an instructor's curriculum instruction and small group interventions are having on increasing the reading proficiency levels for tier 2 and 3 students.

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

UFLI and Go95 programs place structures to support educators for explicit instruction in obtaining scientifically reliable approaches to student obtaining automaticity in decoding and encoding skills. BEST Standards checks through district supplied curriculum; Wonders, iready and Magnetic interventions curriculum aligned with comprehension proficiency that connect to middle and end of year assessments for FAST/STAR. DIBELS district wide progress monitoring system provides efficacy in tracking proficiency levels pertaining to all area of Scarborough Reading Rope; Word Recognition and Language comprehension.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership will meet Monthly and disseminate information to grade-level teams based on current data. Professional Learning will be identified through PLCs and through the use of Literacy Learning Practice profile.	Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@hcps.net
Literacy Coaching will provide modeling through the use of demonstration classroom to communicate schoolwide and instructional expectations as well as provide additional resources to target areas of needs.	Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@hcps.net
Assessment using spotlight checkpoints aligned with BEST standards, i-ready interventions and DIBELS progress monitoring will drive an increase outcome on the end of year FAST/ STAR assessments.	Martin, Kevin, kevin.martin@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 SWP was developed with input from multiple stakeholders including staff and parents. Through the School Advisory Council, the plan was shared and open for comment, questions and suggestions. Monthly SAC meetings are held where we review data from core subject areas and compare that to the SIP to determine if we are being effective and determine if adjustments need to be made.

**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))

As a school, we approved a waiver so that all teachers will send mid-term progress reports home. Our Family Engagement Plan was written to encourage and provide opportunity for families to be a part of the school program. We have worked to re-establish our PTA as a way to provide families fun and educational opportunities to be on campus as a community. Copies of our Family Engagement Plan and the Parent / School Compact in English and Spanish may be found in the 'Announcement' section of the school's main web page.  
<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/site/default.aspx?DomainID=144>

**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)**

The school has hired an academic resource teacher / coach in Literacy, Math and Science to strengthen and enrich our overall academic core programs. Each coach is focusing on ensuring that each and every student is afforded access and opportunity to master critical standards. This is being done through side by side coaching as well as helping teachers create materials that are used in lessons. In addition, teachers in the school are participating in the implementation of "Ruthless Equity".

**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))**

-

### **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))**

-

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

-

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

-

**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

-

**Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**

-

## **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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

**Budget Approval**

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

No