

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Riverhills 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	18
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Riverhills Elementary Magnet School

405 S RIVERHILLS DR, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

<http://riverhills.mysdhc.org>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To guide all learners by providing meaningful opportunities which inspires life long innovators to be caring, responsible, and successful. Students will develop into globally minded citizens through collaboration, reflection, action, and inquiry.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering children to create a better future.

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
Brown, Crystal	Principal	The Principal's job duties and responsibilities include the following: oversee the instructional program, PSLT process, Student data and Progress Monitoring, Student Behavior management, maintain facilities, and any other duty that arises.
Bryant, LaKeyshea	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal's job duties and responsibilities include the following: oversee the instructional program, PSLT process, Student data and Progress Monitoring, Student Behavior management, maintain facilities, and any other duty that arises.

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.

-We have a variety of means to involve all stakeholders in the SIP development process:

1. School Advisory Council invites input from its members which includes staff, parents, students and community partners.
2. Parent surveys invite input on the needs of students and how we as a school can best meet their needs.
3. School-wide events invite students, parents and community partners to attend and participate.

SIP Monitoring

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

-The SIP will be monitored monthly at SAC meetings where student achievement data will be shared, parent input will be shared, and any other needs or discussions will be conducted.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	90%
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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	14	15	18	9	16	0	0	0	73	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	13	18	0	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	24	0	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	14	10	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	21	15	0	0	0	49	
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	2	0	1	4	7	0	0	0	14

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	20	9	7	7	6	0	0	0	49	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	0	7	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	8	0	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	11	0	0	0	0	30	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	15	8	0	0	0	0	23	

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	3

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) 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	20	9	7	7	6	0	0	0	49	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	0	7	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	8	0	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	11	0	0	0	0	30	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	15	8	0	0	0	0	23	

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	3

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	

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*	67	50	53	69	53	56	60		
ELA Learning Gains				77			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66			26		
Math Achievement*	64	56	59	61	50	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				81			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				79			17		
Science Achievement*	62	50	54	53	59	59	52		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	59	59	67			33		

* 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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322
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	69

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	553
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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	58			
HSP	61			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	57			

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	45			
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	55			
HSP	63			

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%
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	88			
FRL	60			

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	67			64			62					58
SWD	33			39			20				3	
ELL	56			69							3	58
AMI												
ASN	91			100							2	
BLK	59			55			56				4	
HSP	63			56			47				4	
MUL	61			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	83			78			70				4	
FRL	58			54			53				4	

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	69	77	66	61	81	79	53					67
SWD	39	67	60	26	56		20					
ELL	72	79		50	79							67
AMI												
ASN	100			100								

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
BLK	51	61	52	45	78	76	20					
HSP	64	83		46	74	70	41					
MUL	75	73		70	91							
PAC												
WHT	89	90		84	83		94					
FRL	56	70	61	46	77	77	29					60

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	60	52	26	52	48	17	52					33
SWD	32	33		29	17		20					
ELL	41			27								33
AMI												
ASN	83			92								
BLK	41	41	27	34	36	17	35					
HSP	58	57		43	36		36					20
MUL	68			58								
PAC												
WHT	82	58		71	60		74					
FRL	46	38	19	34	27	7	31					29

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	71%	53%	18%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	54%	14%	58%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	46%	24%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	55%	21%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	53%	10%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	47%	15%	51%	11%

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 is 69%, which did not increase or decrease from the prior year. Factors contributing to the lack of movement is the new B.E.S.T. standards and staff changes (new Reading resource teacher, new general education teachers and new Principal to the school.

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

-Non of the data points showed a decline from the previous school year.

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 content area with the largest gap was ELA. The state average is 48% and our school average is 69%, showing a 21% positive difference.

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

-Science showed the most improvement from the year before. Weekly common planning with district and administrative support helped to increase the student achievement in science.

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

-The number of students scoring a Level one in ELA and Math are an area of concern.

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

1. Decrease the number of Level 1 students in ELA and Math
2. Increase proficiency in all content areas.
3. Ensure at least 80% of students make gains in all content areas.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The data used for this Area of Focus was the student Panorama survey results. The area of self-efficacy in particular decreased from the previous year, from 58% to 53%. In addition, teacher Insight data was used and the area of peer culture was at 6.8 as compared to the district average of 7.1.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Panorama data in the area of self-efficacy will increase from 53% to 60% and teacher Insight data in the area of peer culture will increase from 6.8 to 7.5.

Monitoring:

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

Student and staff surveys throughout the school year will monitor both areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@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.)

Second Step classroom lessons will be conducted by the Guidance Counselor.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These lessons teach students a variety of skills, to include self-efficacy.

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.

Second Step classroom lessons conducted by the Guidance Counselor.

Person Responsible: Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@hcps.net)

By When: monthly throughout the school year.

Purchase Student Planners to increase school to home communication regarding student performance, behavior and upcoming school-wide events.

Person Responsible: Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@hcps.net)

By When: daily

#2. 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.

Teachers will receive Professional Development in Mathematics and English Language Arts instruction to increase their knowledge of the B.E.S.T. standards and Instructional Frameworks to increase the rigor of content to engage students with lessons/tasks/activities that are aligned to the standard.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This will be measured through weekly walkthroughs, Formal observations and student data to include baseline, midyear, ongoing math and ELA assessments, as well as iReady and progress monitoring data.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through quarterly data chats and analysis of student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@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.)

A Reading Resource teacher will be hired to provide coaching and professional development to teachers for the B.E.S.T. standards. In addition, a book study using the Jennifer Sarravallo book, Reading Strategies 2.0 will be conducted.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing teacher knowledge of the B.E.S.T. standards improves the instructional delivery to students, thus increasing student achievement.

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.

Hire one Reading Resource teacher. The Reading Resource teacher will facilitate collaborative planning sessions that support the development of high quality lesson plans, deepen teacher's understanding around content and best practices in alignment with the B.E.S.T. Standards. The Reading Resource teacher will work with ELA teachers in grades K-5 weekly, including VE teachers that support those grades. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor implementation of collaborative planning. The Reading Resource teacher will conduct small group intensive interventions for select students according to student data and needs.

Person Responsible: Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@hcps.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

Purchase books for ELA Professional Development. The Reading Resource Teacher will conduct a book study with ELA teachers. The book study will be focused on the book Reading Strategies 2.0 by Jennifer Serravallo. We will need 22 copies of the text in order to conduct the book study.

Person Responsible: Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@hcps.net)

By When: By February 2024

Ready Math grades K-5 by Curriculum Associates to provide differentiated instruction to meet the needs of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in math.

Person Responsible: Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@hcps.net)

By When: By January 2024

Hire substitute teaches. To provide teachers an opportunity to collaborate with peers and administration to discuss student achievement and make instructional plans accordingly.

Person Responsible: Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@hcps.net)

By When: Quarterly

Teacher will plan collaboratively for content area instruction and IB integration.

Person Responsible: Crystal Brown (crystal.brown@hcps.net)

By When: weekly throughout the school year

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).

Funding allocations are determined according to student and teacher need based on a variety of data sources (FAST, iReady, district assessments, teacher evaluation and observation data, etc.) Funding sources are reviewed at monthly SAC meetings.

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.

-

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))

-

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)

-

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: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No