

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Northwest Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Northwest Elementary School

16438 HUTCHISON RD, Tampa, FL 33625

[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.

Northwest Elementary believes that all students are important individuals. Our primary purpose is to create a totally positive environment which provides opportunities for academic and personal success through the joint efforts of our faculty, staff and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Northwest Elementary School, we believe that our first commitment is to prepare our students to be productive citizens of the 21st Century.

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
Quigley, Bryan	Principal	The principal job is to ensure that safe, secure and educational rich environment that meets the needs of all students by: Collaborating and problem solving to ensure the implementation of high-quality instructional practices with the core of instruction and utilizing the MTSS process at the Tier 1 and intervention/enrichment Tiers 2/3 levels. Support the implementation of high-quality instruction. Disaggregate progress monitoring data at all levels to ensure fidelity of instruction, and behavioral supports. Facilitate communication of school-wide data to teachers, CPDs (PLCs) and engage stockholders in the problem-solving process. The principal is the instructional leader of the school and the primary person responsible for maintaining a safe and secure learning environment for students, parents and staff.
Cheng, Christine	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is an instructional leader emphasizing curriculum to ensure that every students educational needs are meet. She assists in the disaggregation of progress monitoring data and participates in the problem solving process. She is also responsible for creating and maintaining safety and security of all students and staff. She is the school's testing coordinator, ELP coordinator, and a key member of the PSLT to ensure MTSS interventions are appropriate and successful. She assists the principal in maintaining the school's high expectations for all.
Kennedy, Jill	SAC Member	She is a 2nd grade teacher at Northwest. She ensures that the school is in compliance with SIP plan and guidelines. She hosts and conducts all SAC meetings, records the notes from the meetings and communicates with all members of the SAC.

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 SAC will meet regularly to identify school needs and determine strategies within the SIP to improve student achievement. SAC meetings will include teachers/staff, parents, administration, and CTA member(s) either virtually or in person.

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 teacher leadership team (TLT), school administration and the SAC will monitor student data after each of the 3 progress monitoring assessments and determine if the SIP is increasing student achievement.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	24	19	8	10	11	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	11	6	0	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	6	9	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	7	12	0	0	0	24	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	1	18	11	11	11	8	13	0	0	73	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	12
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	1	18	11	11	11	8	13	0	0	73	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	12
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*	78	50	53	76	53	56	80		
ELA Learning Gains				71			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			60		
Math Achievement*	80	56	59	83	50	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				81			74		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				82			65		
Science Achievement*	76	50	54	70	59	59	63		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	59	59	45			50		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
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	48			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK	67			
HSP	73			
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	79			

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%
FRL	66			

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	58			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	61			
HSP	65			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	72			

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	78			80			76					57
SWD	46			52			36				4	
ELL	53			53			40				4	57
AMI												
ASN	94			100							2	
BLK	67			67							2	
HSP	73			76			74				5	61
MUL	85			92							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	80			81			77				4	
FRL	69			74			56				5	67

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	76	71	54	83	81	82	70					45
SWD	45	53	43	67	81	80	39					
ELL	59	75	79	59	67	55	25					45
AMI												
ASN	85	93		90	93							
BLK	63	33		74	75							
HSP	70	77	55	75	75	74	56					40
MUL	56	55		73	73							
PAC												
WHT	84	69	57	90	86	100	83					
FRL	69	67	64	77	77	83	65					

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	80	67	60	75	74	65	63					50
SWD	41	40	42	39	40	27	23					
ELL	44			52								50
AMI												
ASN	88			88								
BLK	56			61								
HSP	73	63	50	68	78	55	50					56
MUL	60			60								
PAC												
WHT	89	74	73	81	74	80	75					
FRL	70	64	60	67	69	54	48					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	84%	53%	31%	54%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	54%	20%	58%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	46%	29%	50%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	83%	55%	28%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	59%	22%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	47%	28%	51%	24%

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.

School Discipline Data showed increases in Parent Pick Up, ISS and OSS. Unsuccessful Tier 1 behavior systems, and insufficient Tier 1 Positive Behavior Supports.

On FCAT Science 73% of students scored level 3 or higher which was 11% lower than the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher on FAST Reading (84%).

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

The Number of Parent Pick Ups doubled.

While the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher increased on FCAT Science overall, the differential between the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher in Reading increased. In 2022, the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher in science was 70% and the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher in reading was 75%, a differential of 5%. In 2023 that differential between science and reading increased to 11% (73% science vs 84% reading).

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.

State discipline data is not available..

All of Northwest's data is above the state average.

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

None- All of the discipline areas increased in frequency.

The percent of students scoring level 3 or higher in 3rd grade reading increase 10% from 69% to 79%.

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

In addition to the discipline numbers, the number of students with attendance below 90%

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

1. Decrease the number of students that earn discipline consequences of a parent Pick up, ISS or OSS.
2. Increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Science in spring 2024.

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.

Northwest's focus is to increase the Positive School Culture and Environment by decreasing the number of students that earn the discipline consequences of a Parent Pick-Up, In School Suspension (ISS) or Out of School Suspension (OSS). Northwest will implement Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) for behavior. Northwest will implement schoolwide Tier 1 behavior expectations/system, define Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior/ supports. Grades will implement Tier 1 Positive Behavior Supports (PBS). Teachers will implement classroom culture building activities (Resiliency, Character and Life Skills Education). Teachers will provide parents with a weekly individual student behavior communication of the behavior expectations on the report card.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of student Discipline Consequences: Parent Pick up, ISS and OSS will decrease from 34 to 17.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly review of discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bryan Quigley (bryan.quigley@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.)

Northwest will implement Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) for behavior. Northwest will implement schoolwide Tier 1 Behavior expectations/system, define Tier 2 & 3 Tier 3 behavior supports. Grades will implement Tier 1 Positive Behavior Supports (PBS). Teachers will implement classroom culture building activities (Resiliency, Character and Life Skills Education). Teachers will provide parents with a weekly individual student behavior communication of the behaviors listed on the report card.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A robust schoolwide Tier 1 behavior systems and support will reduce the frequency of off task and/or inappropriate student behavior. Implementing schoolwide Resiliency, Character and Life Skill Education will positively increase the classroom and school culture. Implementing Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) will reinforce and motivate students to make good choices. Increasing parent communication of off task and/or inappropriate student behavior(s) will enable parents to support their child's behavioral needs and the school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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.

On FCAT Science 73% of students scored level 3 or higher which was 11% lower than the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher on FAST Reading (84%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students level 3 or higher on FCAT Science will be the same or higher than the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Science.

Monitoring:

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

Using district assessments will be used to monitor the progress in science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers in all grades K-5 will implement the following best practices in science instruction: interactive science journals, LTI-long term investigations, hands-on learning opportunities, vocabulary development and all students will participate in the STEM Fair.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The current best practices develop the students understanding of the science standards. These standards are assessed on the FCAT Science Test.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

All grades K-2, more than 50% students score at or above level 3

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

All Grade 3-5, more than 50% of students scored at or above level 3

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

-

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

-

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.

After each progress monitoring, the TLT, school leadership will review student data to determine if students are making progress to ensure that all grades K-5 have 50% of the students (or more) score level 3 or higher on the PM3.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Quigley, Bryan, bryan.quigley@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?

NA- No grades K-5 scored below 50% level 3

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?

-

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

NA- No grades K-5 scored below 50% level 3