

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Robinson Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Robinson Elementary School

4801 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33567

[ 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.**

J. S. Robinson will provide all students the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

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

J. S. Robinson will provide all students the best education in the county.

### 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
Delgado, Timothy	Principal	instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others
Gilmore, Katherine	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in leading instruction to staff, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others
Bikowski, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	to assist language arts teachers in guided instruction and offer them support to enhance student learning
Shepherd, Kari	Instructional Coach	to assist teachers in math instruction aligned with standards to enhance student performance.

Other

**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.

School leadership team meets to discuss data and develops a plan

**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 plan and areas of focus will be monitored and discussed monthly to ensure action steps are being implemented effectively and adjustments are being made as needed. Instructional coaches will be meeting with teams weekly to plan effective lessons aligned with standards o meet needs of students.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	72%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	20	27	20	16	1	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	1	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	32	32	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	19	0	0	0	0	40
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	1	1	0	4	8	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	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	



**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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

**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*	36	50	53	35	53	56	38		
ELA Learning Gains				53			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			50		
Math Achievement*	52	56	59	52	50	50	42		
Math Learning Gains				72			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			43		
Science Achievement*	31	50	54	31	59	59	32		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	59	59	48			49		

\* 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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	221
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

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	407
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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	41			

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	43			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	51			

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				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	51			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	36			52			31					61
SWD	19			34			38				5	47
ELL	25			41			20				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			50							2	
HSP	30			47			29				5	62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45			62			31				4	
FRL	32			48			28				5	60

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	35	53	57	52	72	59	31					48
SWD	27	49	52	42	58	57	22					37
ELL	27	50	58	46	73	68	18					48
AMI												
ASN												

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	45			55								
HSP	32	54	63	51	73	63	27					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40	51	42	53	71	50	36					
FRL	35	54	57	52	72	63	29					46

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	38	40	50	42	52	43	32					49
SWD	26	37	47	33	43	35	19					38
ELL	26	34	47	31	42	35	20					49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			45								
HSP	33	39	48	38	48	39	27					49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	39		49	58		47					
FRL	35	38	48	38	48	39	26					49

**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	37%	53%	-16%	54%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	54%	-15%	58%	-19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	37%	46%	-9%	50%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	55%	-6%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	59%	7%	61%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	26%	47%	-21%	51%	-25%

### 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.**

Only 8% of students who are ELL scored proficiency in ELA on state assessments. The top contributing factor is the language acquisition. Our teachers need to use a variety of resources to enhance learning of our ELL students. At school is the only time many of these students hear the English language being spoken. Other factors consist of culture, poor attendance, lack of parent support to assist student's needs, and lack of vocabulary or schema to help comprehend.

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

Our schools Science scores dropped from 33% of students scoring at proficiency to 26% of students scoring proficiency of a 3 or higher. There was a 5 % drop from the previous school year in student performance. Many teachers spend extended time on Math instruction and shorten instruction in science content. This causes students to struggle in having foundational skills in to support them when being assessed. Students reading ability also plays a huge factor in scores below proficiency and understanding how to break apart questions and justify answers.

**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.**

When looking at our school's data the subject area that had the greatest gap of proficient scores compared to the state was Science. 51% of students across the state scored proficiency in science, whereas only 26% of students at Robinson in 5th grade were proficient. 8% of ELL students were proficient and 21% of students who qualify for SWD were proficient. Lack of focus on science instruction aligned with standards was the leading factor of students' poor performance and the amount of Reading involved on the Science assessment.

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

Looking at data from 2022-2023 school year, the content area that students at Robinson Elementary showed the most improvement in was Math increasing 3% from a 52% to a 55%. In 3rd grade our scores increased 6% from a 44 to a 51. In 4th grade they improved 12 % from a 56 to a 68. In 5th grade they dropped from 53 to 48 percent. Teachers adhere small group quality instruction aligned with standards and designated weekly planning sessions as the factors that helped students make gains. Planning sessions were collaborative by grade level with our instructional coach's support to analyze data and plan instruction based on greatest needs. Other factors that played a role were hands on learning opportunities with manipulatives, teaching testing strategies to break apart questions and instructing students ton ways to justify answer choices, and common assessments.

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

Behavior management in primary grades and loss of instruction led to learning gaps identified in students in later grades that caused them to perform poorly on standardized assessments.

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

Our team feels like the highest concerns that we need to prioritize are our ELL subgroups in all subjects, especially ELA. When students are proficient in ELA it will improve the likelihood of other subjects showing gains because of the ability to read. Science scores are also a major concern and a plan needs to be developed and implemented to improve the amount of proficient scores. Lastly, vocabulary across all subjects is a high priority to assist students in creating schema, especially the ELL population to allow them to be more successful.

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****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.

Increased support of our ELL population of 72% due to major learning gaps and failing to show proficiency. In Reading and Science only 8% of ELL students were proficient last year and 13% in Math. Our goal is to relentlessly focus on developing teacher efficacy through collaborative planning of standard based instruction, including differentiation and setting goals for targeted groups with an emphasis on ELL. Classroom teachers will embed ESOL strategies throughout core instruction across all content areas. Walk thru feedback by content coaches and administrative observations will be conducted regularly to progress monitor and ensure teachers are supported with fidelity.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Create a culture of shared accountability through aligned standard based instruction through B.E.S.T standards to increase proficiency in student gains for ELL students. Common assessments will be used and analyzed; ELA spotlights, Imagine Learning, Quarterly Math and Science Assessments, DIBELS, STAR/FAST, and WIDA assessments.

**Monitoring:**

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

Proficiency will be monitored by quarterly data chats with administration and leadership team to target students who are well below proficiency. Students' performance level will be monitored through collaborative data analysis and weekly grade level planning sessions and professional learning communities to identify weaknesses and specific students who are falling two levels below proficiency. Students falling in this category will be recognized by tiers and progress monitored through MTSS; by setting personalized goals based on needs and providing feedback through conferencing. Vertical planning sessions will also be held monthly to establish norms, consistency with vocabulary, and identify trends.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@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.)

Elevation Strategies will be shared by ELL department and implemented in the classroom to support language acquisition. Collaborative planning sessions with our ELL specialist and content coaches to analyze data on progress monitoring and effectively planned based on targeted ELL students' needs. Consistent small group interventions grouped strategically, based on data trends to help focus on targeted areas. Professional Development to support culturally responsive instruction by our ELL specialist, presented based on data and needs. We will increase parental involvement and representation through monthly communication of learning objectives and standards being taught through emails, newsletters, etc. Parents will attend monthly SAC meetings and be involved in decision making. Parent Support nights will be held to assist with coaching and activities to do at home.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To strengthen our collaborative approach through professional supports with coaches, specialists, and ELL support to work as a more cohesive unit and increase students gains in a culturally responsive



practice. It is a priority to support communication and include all stakeholders in decision making, parents, community, administration, teachers and content coaches .

**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.

- Progress Monitor and Data Analysis Quarterly
- Communication binders between parents and teachers
- Collaborative planning with content coaches and specialists
- Ongoing instructional feedback from walkthroughs

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@hcps.net)

**By When:** May of 2024

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****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.

After reviewing data from the 2022-2023 school year, we are in critical need to improve students' proficiency in science standardized test. 26% of our 5th grade students scored proficiency on the FSSA statewide assessment last school year. We will realign our focus on improving in depth collaborative planning in science instruction related to state standards with the help of our science coach. We will use common assessments to analyze data and use a backwards planning method. We will implement hands on engaging activities to connect learning and help students apply concepts learned. We will monitor students' progress monthly through content mini assessments.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase overall proficiency in science measured by the SSA assessment in May and monitor progress frequently.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will use quarterly assessments aligned with standards taught, mini assessments and checkpoints, self-assessed written responses, student learning outcomes, teacher observations, and yearly SSA statewide assessments. We will also maintain fidelity on adhering to content focused schedules.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@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.)

Collaborative planning sessions and whole group modeled lessons with content coaches, school wide long-term investigations, fidelity checks, Nature of Science Application, integrate vocabulary through weekly checkpoints schoolwide, real-world connections, hands on learning with experiments and investigations to enhance engagement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To strengthen our student's vocabulary and background knowledge to apply concepts learned and make real world connections. To continue our collaborative planning techniques aligned with standards and engage students through science notebooks, collecting evidence/measurable data, student led discussions, and develop conclusions of lessons learned through investigations.

**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.

Weekly team planning with content coach, monthly PLC's with vertical team planning across grade levels and subjects to collaborate on effective reading strategies of breaking down of questions etc. Interactive student notebooks and grade level long term investigations and monthly communication of learning goals and progress monitoring.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@hcps.net)

**By When:** May 2024

**#3. -- Select below -- 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.

Increasing positive culture at Robinson Elementary would help increase proficiency in our ELA state assessment scores, focusing predominantly with our ELL population. Creating an environment where parents are involved monthly will increase a culture built around creating collective efficacy.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

To increase our core performance we are focusing our culture goal on parent involvement and student academic behavior to increase family and student efficacy.

**Monitoring:**

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

It will be monitored three times a year through FAST PM data to increase parental involvement and support for student learning. When more parents get involved in their child's learning environment scores are likely to increase.

**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.)

Robinson uses a schoolwide positive incentive program; PBIS to provide the best learning environment necessary for optimum educational growth. Our school hands out JSR bucks when students are following Roads Expectations throughout the school and making positive choices. These consist of being respectful and responsible, on task, always safe, and do your best. Monthly recognition and rewards are also earned through class stores and school wide events for students to be rewarded with incentives for good behavior. We will also be having showcase events this school year to show off students work in the classroom and build a rewarding culture atmosphere here at Robinson.

Our school will also increase culture by partnering with Family First monthly where caregivers and children can make connections around character development and relationship building.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This researched based system creates a positive learning environment and enhances student achievement. The plan ensures that all students have the right to learn, and teachers have the right to teach without disruption.

**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.

All teachers will utilize a common grade level communication binder which allows teachers to support students and their parents to track their academic progress withing content areas and on-grade level standards.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@hcps.net)

**By When:** May of 2023

#### #4. 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.

After reviewing our data for our early warning indicators, due to our low performing scores on statewide assessments in both Math and ELA we are creating a positive culture and environment goal. We want to get more involvement from parents to help improve academic scores. We had 64 students score a Level 1 on the ELA statewide assessment and 40 students score a Level 1 on Math statewide assessments. By creating a culture built on collective efficacy with parents and families we will engage in empowering students to set personal goals to improve course performance and communicate their performance goals with their parents through a communication binder structure. During the school day, students will be engaged in a PBIS system that rewards expectations for positive behavior.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase parent involvement and decrease the number of students who score a Level 1 on ELA and Math FAST assessments.

##### Monitoring:

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

FAST assessment scores to show learning gains  
Attendance at schoolwide events where parents are involved

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Timothy Delgado (timothy.delgado@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.)

Family first meetings with parents  
All Pro Dads to implement goal setting for both behavior and academics  
JSR bucks rewarding students  
Communication binders  
School mystery events for positive behavior  
Class stores

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that the more parent involvement and positive reinforcement students perform at higher levels.

##### 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

Based on STAR ELA statewide assessment scores 48% of students in grades K-2 were proficient; 56% Kindergarten students were at or above the benchmark, 46% of 1st graders, and 41% of 2nd graders were at or above benchmark. Many of these scores were low due to our deficient ELL and ESE teaching strategies that inadequately met the needs of our student population, which impacted their on-grade level performance and showed a need for acceleration and a shift to implement the science of Reading including strengthening basic foundational skills, and also specific ELL and ESE teaching strategies to close the existing achievement gap.

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

Based on FAST ELA statewide assessment scores 38.5% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient; 39% of 3rd graders, 40% of 4th graders, and 37% of fifth graders were proficient. Many of these scores were low due to our deficient ELL and ESE teaching strategies that inadequately met the needs of our student population, which impacted their on-grade level performance and showed a need for acceleration and a shift to implement the science of Reading including strengthening basic foundational skills, and also specific ELL and ESE teaching strategies to close the existing achievement gap.

### 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

The percentage of grades K-2 students scoring proficient, will increase to 57% or higher as measured by the Spring ELA assessment.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of grades 3-5 students scoring proficient, which is a level 3 or higher will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the 2024 ELA state assessment.

## 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.

Students' progress will be monitored monthly and quarterly through formal, informal, and teacher made assessments and observations. After analyzing monthly data, teachers will implement conferencing with students to set individualized goals and utilize collaborative planning with peers to recognize struggling students and create an action plan.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Delgado, Tim, tim.delgado@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?

We will implement structured planning groups with ELA teams weekly led by our ELA coaches withing all grade levels. We will look at spotlight and unit assessments along with guided text set questions to use as a bases for backward planning. We will incorporate the use of ESE and ELL teaching strategies to impact a variety of leaners and allow ownership of completion of work, student led questioning techniques around the room in many different forms, and engaging strategies to hold students' attention and maintain focus.



**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?

-Aligning instruction with backward planning methods teachers will be able to guide instruction with best practices to help students maintain progress on assessments and be supported by ESE and ELL teachers to implement effective strategies.

**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
-The reading coach will facilitate planning sessions with all grade levels incorporating promoting questions that illicit teacher discussion and plans that meet consistent expectations and high-quality instruction. Teachers will review assessments and participate in backwards planning methods.	Bikowski, Stephanie, stephanie.bikowski@hcps.net
Administration, District content support, reading consultant and Reading coach will conduct walkthroughs to collect evidence for look Fors; progress monitoring, conferencing, rigorous instruction, engagement and differentiation and provide constructive feedback.	Delgado, Timothy, timothy.delgado@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 information will be disseminated through a parent newsletter link, online linked via Robinson Elementary school website. Staff will continue to receive biweekly updates via faculty meeting and common planning sessions on our status towards achieving our SIP goals.

**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))

We have created Student Showcase Nights that will take place 3 times a year for students to connect with their families around their education. In addition, every three weeks a Caregiver Communication binder will go home for students to conference with their parents to discuss their academic progress and involve parents for support.

**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)**

-WE plan on supporting instruction through common grade level planning, providing ongoing feedback through a well-planned observation cycle, grade level and specific teacher data discussions, and provide teachers with job embedded professional development as needed.

**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))**

-