

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Muller Elementary Magnet 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Muller Elementary Magnet School

13615 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33613

[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.

Muller Elementary Magnet School, staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Muller Elementary Magnet School will prepare students for life through the arts, science, and leadership.

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
Bottini, Melanie	Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional Leadership 2. Safety and Security of all Stakeholders 3. Building Management 4. Culture Building
Pryor, Michelle	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional Leadership 2. Safety and Security of all Stakeholders 3. Building Management 4. Culture Building
Mansfield, Lyndee	School Counselor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Culture Building 2. SEL Lessons with Students
Weber, Mitchell	Magnet Coordinator	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assists in the recruitment, selection, and placement of staff for Magnet schools, Computer Science, and CTE programs. 2. Participates in the observation and evaluation of teachers in the stated areas of supervision. 3. Assists teachers and programs in the stated areas of supervision.
Freiner, Kallie	Math Coach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Math Instruction 2. Math Planning with Teachers 3. Math Coaching Instruction 4. Math Data Analysis 5. Math Professional Development
Leach, Faye	Reading Coach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading Instruction 2. Reading Planning with Teachers 3. Reading Coaching Instruction 4. Reading Data Analysis 5. Reading Professional Development

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 school leadership team and School Advisory Council meet to analyze school data, reflect upon 2022-23 academic, attendance, and behavior progress, and draft ideas for the SIP.

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 school leadership team and School Advisory Council will meet at least monthly to regularly review the SIP and determine if the desired progress toward the Measurable Outcome(s) in the SIP is on target to be achieved. Leadership and SAC will monitor results from the Area of Focus and make adjustments as needed.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	91%
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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	12	17	10	12	7	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4
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	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	

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	7	3	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	12	17	10	12	7	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	26	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	25	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	7	3	0	0	0	0	10

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	47	50	53	49	53	56	43		
ELA Learning Gains				55			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			29		
Math Achievement*	58	56	59	56	50	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				56			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			44		
Science Achievement*	53	50	54	49	59	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	60			60		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	275
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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	415
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	25	Yes	2	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	52			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	88			
FRL	48			

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	48			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	48			

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	47			58			53					64
SWD	20			33			24				4	
ELL	36			53							4	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			53			57				4	
HSP	43			59			50				5	62
MUL	43			43							2	
PAC												
WHT	90			81							3	
FRL	36			53			45				5	62

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	49	55	50	56	56	40	49					60
SWD	14	42	50	37	42	12	37					30
ELL	39	39	33	46	36		41					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	50		59	68		63					
HSP	51	58	42	53	47	24	44					63
MUL	38			46								
PAC												
WHT	44	67		59	58							
FRL	44	52	50	49	53	36	39					59

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	43	45	29	52	61	44	45					60
SWD	11	31		28	38		8					50
ELL	28			50								60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	46	30	48	54		43					
HSP	39	43		51	70		35					61
MUL				70								
PAC												
WHT	60			60								
FRL	38	47	31	48	62	43	42					58

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	46%	53%	-7%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	54%	-6%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	53%	46%	7%	50%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	55%	17%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	59%	-9%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	51%	1%

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 reading proficiency. In 2021-2022, our ELA proficiency was 49%. The last school year we maintained the same proficiency of 49%. The contributing factors were students moved from testing paper/pencil, to testing on the computers, that changed the way students were able to show their learning. The trends revealed that many students maintained their growth and there was growth from PM 1 to PM 3 across the board. Moving forward ,we plan to use more strategic monitoring of student progress and an individualized needs assessment to drive next steps.

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

The data that showed the greatest decline this year was our primary I-Ready Data. The number of students on level in reading decreased from one year to the next. This is due to the lack on foundational instruction with phonics. This upcoming year we will progress monitor through Dibels to help diagnose and assess student needs and plan instruction accordingly.

2021-2022

K- 79% on level
1- 64% on level
2- 65%% on level

2022-2023

K- 76% on level
1- 58% on level
2- 58% on level

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 with the greatest gap compared to the state was ELA in 4th grade. Our school's average scale score was 307 for 4th grade ELA and the state average scale score was 312. The gap was due to the need for more targeted and intentional small group instruction to meet student needs. Content knowledge will be addressed in conjunction with the vertical PLCs and planning to help fill instructional gaps from the previous year.

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

Math data has the highest level of proficiency. It has increased from 56% proficiency to 60% overall. Additionally, our science proficiency increased from 49% to 52%. Our school will continue to target specific students and develop plans based on their individual needs, opposed to only groups of students.

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

An area of growth is overall attendance and reading proficiency in 3rd and 4th grade. In 4th grade there are 12 students with attendance indicators and 22 students with an ELA course indicating failure. In 3rd grade there are 10 students with attendance indicators and 18 students with an ELA course indicating failure.

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

- 1- Overall reading proficiency will increase at our school to 55% by May of 2023
- 2- Overall math proficiency will increase at our school to 65% by May of 2023
- 3- Overall science proficiency will increase to 56% by May of 2023
- 4- Overall Attendance for the students to maintain 95% or above

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

The need to increase student proficiency levels is a critical need based on 2022-2023 Reading, Math, and Science FAST and SSA data. Instruction will align with the new B.E.S.T standards.

Our Instructional Priorities are: Student achievement will increase through progress monitoring and using data to drive instructional decision making.

*students are aware of their academic progress and goals

*teachers have an understanding of the where all students stand academically and where they need to go to meet the benchmarks

To ensure that this is taking place, walkthroughs will be conducted by the Principal and Assistant Principal.

Specific walkthrough look-fors include: what the teacher is doing, what students are doing and how decisions are being made by the students and teacher based on data. The systems for progress monitoring will be set up for staff to engage with.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase Reading proficiency by 8% points in May 2024.

We will increase Math proficiency by 9% points in May 2024.

We will increase Science proficiency by 8% points in May 2024

Monitoring:

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

Our Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Checklist and the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction will be used to give actionable walkthrough feedback to each instructional staff member. Immediately following a walkthrough, written feedback is given directly to the teacher in the classroom by the principal or sent electronically by the assistant principal.

The Leadership Team will analyze the observation trends and determine the next steps. The Leadership Team, which includes both the school Reading Resource and the Math Resource teachers will coach and support planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@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.)

Evidence of increased teacher effectiveness through improved targeted feedback (.75 is feedback effect size) to teachers from walkthroughs using the Instructional Priorities Checklist (1.57 is teacher efficacy effect size)

Utilize progress monitoring to gauge student progress and understanding towards benchmarks (1.33 is self-reported grades effect size and self-efficacy is .92)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The improvement strategy of targeted feedback to teachers will result in improved progress monitoring and data to drive instructional decisions and practices.

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.

2023 FAST Data is analyzed and reviewed by administration.

Assistant Principal writes Instructional Priorities

The Instructional Priorities is edited and approved by the Leadership Team.

Teachers create the Walkthrough Look-Fors

Assistant Principal shares walkthrough trends with the staff.

Principal shares Instructional Priorities Checklist with instructional staff.

Walkthroughs with immediate feedback are conducted consistently.

Person Responsible: Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

By When: 2023 FAST Data is analyzed and reviewed by administration - by August 2023 Assistant Principal writes Instructional Priorities by August 2023 The Instructional Priorities is edited and approved by the Leadership Team. by August 2023 Teachers create the Walkthrough Look-Fors- by August 2023 Assistant Principal shares walkthrough trends with the staff- by September 2023 Principal shares Instructional Priorities Checklist with instructional staff- by September 2023 Walkthroughs with immediate feedback are conducted consistently- by September 2023

#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.

An area of focus for us this upcoming year is student attendance. In 2022-2023 we had 138 of our 430 students with 10 or more absences for the year. Student attendance is critical to increasing student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

138 of the 430 students is 32% of the total students at Muller Elementary Magnet School. By May of 2024, we intend to decrease the number of students with 10 absences or more to 113 students, or 26% of the total number of students at our school.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by the Attendance Team: School Social Worker, Data Processor, and the Principal. It will be monitored by taking action early with students by identifying and removing barriers for families who are starting a pattern of attendance in which they are missing school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@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.)

Incentives will be used for perfect attendance along with celebrations. The attendance team will communicate early and often with families, to get ahead of students who have shown multiple absences. Students will be monitored and communicated with as soon as they have an unexcused absence to address concerns.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is that our team will build relationships early with families, so they can see the value in getting their child to school each day, resulting in children growing to their highest potential. Additionally, the team will provide resources for families, such as bussing and city bus passes to support families who are struggling, in hopes of addressing any barriers.

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.

Identify the list of students who had more than 10 absences in 2022-2023
Contact families after their first unexcused absence
Note the conversation and possible barriers

Address the possible barriers and develop a plan moving forward with the family
Implement incentives for student attendance
Implement celebrations for student attendance quarterly
Celebrate improved attendance with students

Person Responsible: Melanie Bottini (melanie.bottini@hcps.net)

By When: by October of 2023, we will have the system in place to continuously track student attendance and team support.

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).

n/a

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

Our instructional priorities are: Student achievement will increase through consistent instructional coaching in ELA.

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

Based on the 2023 FSA Scores where 68% in 3rd grade, 63% in 4th grade, and 61% in 5th grade scored a level 3 proficiency or higher, 37% of the 4th graders (now 5th graders) are not on track to score a level 3 or above. The need to increase student proficiency levels is a critical need based on 2022-2023 Reading, Math, and Science FSA Data. Instruction will align with B.E.S.T. standards.

Our instructional priorities are: Student achievement will increase through consistent instructional coaching in ELA.

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

- Using B.E.S.T. standards, FAST Assessment results, instructional coaching and continuous progress monitoring, we will increase Reading proficiency by 11 points in December 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

- Using B.E.S.T. standards, FAST Assessment results, instructional coaching and continuous progress monitoring, we will increase Reading proficiency by 11 points in December 2024.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

- Instructional Priorities Walkthrough checklist and Four Principles of Excellent Instruction will be used to give actionable walkthrough feedback to each instructional staff member. Immediately following a walkthrough, written feedback is given directly to the teacher in the classroom by the principal or sent electronically by the assistant principal.

Leadership Team will analyze the observation trends and determine next steps. Leadership Team includes the school Reading Resource teacher who will coach and support planning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Leach, Faye, faye.leach@sdhc.k12.fl.us

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?

-Identified evidence based practice of increased teacher effectiveness through improved targeted feedback from the instructional coach to the teachers (.75 feedback effect size) and opportunities to evaluate deliberate practice (.79 evaluate practice effect size) and reflect (.75 reflection effect size). These practices are aligned with the K-12 comprehensive evidence based Reading plan and B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

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?

-Targeted feedback and instructional coaching will be used to increase teacher effectiveness. In order to increase student achievement, evidence of increased teacher effectiveness through improved targeted feedback from the instructional coach to teachers has a .75 effect size, opportunities to evaluate deliberate practice has a .79 effect size, and reflection has a .75 effect size.

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-Reading Coach attends weekly meetings with administration on the Leadership team, shares reading needs, data, progress, leads training, leads reading PLCs, and leads reading planning with teachers.

Bottini, Melanie,
melanie.bottini@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 is posted on the school website (<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/muller.>) All Title 1 information is sent home to parents in both English and Spanish via a physical flyer and digitally on the Peach Jar App. Stakeholders are also kept up to date at the monthly SAC meetings.

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))

SAC member invitations were introduced to parents verbally and through a physical invitation in both English and Spanish. Schoolwide events are consistently held to provide multiple updates and resources. Electronic surveys are sent out after each schoolwide event for Leadership and staff to make accommodations.

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 plans to strengthen academic programming in school, increase the quality learning time through our Title 1 Academic Coaches. They lead the learning and growth of our teachers. We target and identify areas of need within the students and staff and develop a plan to support implementation. This is done through our weekly leadership meetings in which we review student and staff data as it aligns to our areas of focus.

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))

The plan is developed and addresses our ESSA groups specifically. When diving deeper into our data and student/teacher need, we unpack the groups of students recognized through ESSA to identify areas of strength and areas of growth that need our additional attention. This is monitored as a team through our data wall, and shared with the staff during PLCS. We are creating, implementing, and monitoring action plans continuously, to adjust to student and teacher need as it changes/develops throughout the year.

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))

n/a

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))

n/a

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).

n/a

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))

n/a

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))

n/a

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: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	\$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.

Yes