Seffner Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Seffner Elementary School

109 CACTUS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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.

We will equip, empower and enrich our future leaders - E3

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ignite a passion for learning!

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
Mathurin, Renel	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders and collaborates with others.
Claffie, Kristine	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders and collaborates with others.
Whitehead, Amy	SAC Member	The SAC Chair works with the site-based leadership team and the SAC Team to collaborate with stakeholders.
Brown, Aimee	Other	ESE Specialist and Instructional Leadership team member-serves in the capacity of ESE specialist and PLC facilitator.
Mounce, Sara	Other	Serves as the media specialist and Instructional Leadership team member and PLC facilitator.

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 improvement plan was drafted with the School Leadership, SAC Chair and the Instructional Leadership Team. This plan is based on a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that takes into account information on the academic performance of children in relation to the challenging state academic standards.

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))

Based upon our goals and strategies, the School Improvement Plan will be monitored through the use of data collection: quarterly walkthroughs, content area assessments and skill assessments. The data will be presented at our monthly SAC meeting with adjustments to the academic plan 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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
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) 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: 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	0	18	13	11	17	14	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
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	28	19	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	12	0	0	0	0	38
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	2	11	5	0	0	0	18

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	2	1	0	0	0	5

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	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	2	2	1	0	0	0	5

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*	40	50	53	43	53	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				59			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			39		
Math Achievement*	44	56	59	45	50	50	28		
Math Learning Gains				58			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31			36		
Science Achievement*	63	50	54	30	59	59	30		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	33	59	59	50			78		

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	206
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	18	Yes	4	1
ELL	24	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	4	2
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	39	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	3	1
HSP	46			

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	54			
FRL	44			

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	40			44			63					33
SWD	21			17							3	
ELL	11			28							3	33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			35							2	
HSP	33			39			56				5	25
MUL	46			38							2	
PAC												
WHT	51			52			68				4	
FRL	33			39			58				5	31

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	43	59	54	45	58	31	30					50
SWD	31	46		34	54		32					
ELL	12	58		35	69							50
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	20	37		23	32		14					
HSP	36	61	73	36	59	38	18					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	63	40	59	64		44					
FRL	38	59	54	41	55	31	23					50

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	40	41	39	28	38	36	30					78
SWD	37	54		23	77							
ELL	29			29								78
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	30		28	50							
HSP	27	27		17	27	33	21					80
MUL	47			33								
PAC												
WHT	50	67		34	46		44					
FRL	35	34	40	25	37	44	27					78

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	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	54%	0%	58%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	26%	46%	-20%	50%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	23%	55%	-32%	59%	-36%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	47%	9%	51%	5%

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 lowest performing area was ELA (45% proficiency). Factors that contributed to new benchmark and students entering the new grade level with foundational skills deficiencies.

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

None of the data points showed a decline from the previous year. In ELA we improved from 43% proficiency to 45% proficiency; In Math, we improved from 45% proficiency to 47% proficiency and in Science we improved from 30% proficiency to 63% proficiency.

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.

3rd grade ELA and Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Staff knowledge of new benchmark and student foundational skills deficits.

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

Science showed the most improvement from the 2020 school year to the 2023 school year (30% proficiency 67% proficiency). 5th grade had weekly planning with the DRT. Teachers analyzed science data on a weekly basis and set goals with their students.

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

Attendance: almost 1/3 of students in every grade level had 10 or absences.

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

ELA proficiency, ELA and Math gains and ELA and Math Bottom quartile gains

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

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

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

Positive Culture and environment specially relating to student attendance. We will focus on improving student attendance in order to positively impact student achievement. Particularly, with students who are chronically absent defined as missing 10% or more of the school year.

Rationale: Department of Education and Gotttfried's 2019, explains that students who are are chronically absent (missing 10% or more of the school year) have lower achievement outcomes.

The number of students with attendance below 90% are as follows:
Grade 1- 18
Grade 2- 13
Grade 3-11
Grade 4-17
Grade 5-14

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

Goal is to reduce the number of students with attendance below the 90% goal will be as follows by May 2024:
Grade 1- 8
Grade 2-3
Grade 3-1
Grade 4-7
Grade 5- 4

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

PSLT team will meet weekly to review the below 90% attendance list by grade and provide teachers with a watch list. The data processor will submit a daily attendance report to the Social Worker to monitor and report progress. Attendance plans will be designed as interventions for students who are at risk of falling below the goal of 90%.
PSLT will team biweekly to adjust actions steps in this area of focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Kristine Claffie (kristine.claffie@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.)

RTI for attendance will be used to provide interventions for students in need of improvement in attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

RTI is a schoolwide process that supports students at all tiers. The following resource documents the effectiveness of RTI:
John Hattie's Effect Size on Response to Intervention 1.29

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.

Send out attendance letter to stakeholders via student communication folder, parent link and social media.

Person Responsible: Renel Mathurin (renel.mathurin@hcps.net)

By When: August 28th

Review 90% list of students with PSLT to analyze students with a history of poor attendance from last school year.

Person Responsible: Kristine Claffie (kristine.claffie@hcps.net)

By When: August 14

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Our area of focus is identified as Benchmark-aligned-instruction. This are of focus for core instruction across content areas. Our instructional priority will employ instructional strategies that allow students to master grade level benchmark. This will be achieved with a focus on Modeling and Direct Instruction during core instruction in ELA, Math, and Science. Planning will focus on the gradual release of responsibility model to ensure an explicit model is highlighted during instruction to ensure students are successful before being release for independent work. During collaborative planning, teachers will design and practice ways to check for understanding during instruction to ensure students are successful ins mastering the benchmark.

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

Measurable Outcomes Include:
By December 2023, 80% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided opportunities for students to be engaged in benchmark-aligned tasks for their grade level.
By December 2023, 80% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided students with an explicit model during instruction.
By December 2023, 80% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided students with a check for understanding during instruction.

By May 2024, 100% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided opportunities for students to be engaged in benchmark-aligned tasks for their grade level.
By May 2024, 100% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided students with an explicit model during instruction.
By May 2024, 100% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided students with a check for understanding during instruction.

In May 2024, 50 % of students in grades 3 -5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the FAST ELA Assessment.
In May 2024, 50% of students in grades 3 - 5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the FAST MATH Assessment.
In May 2024, 65% of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the Science FSA Assessment.

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

Walkthroughs will be completed by the Leadership Team. Grade level trend data will be gathered and analyzed during monthly ILT meetings. Look-fors have been created and shared with teachers based on our instructional priority. Look-fors have been determined by phases with Phase 1 serving as our entry point and Phase 3 indicated our desired outcome.
Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly and trend data will be reviewed and analyzed on the following ILT Meeting.

An electronic form has been created to collect evidence during walkthroughs.

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.)

According to Hattie the following evidence-based interventions relate to (Instructional Priority) Direct Instruction and Modeling of benchmark aligned instruction.

Teacher Clarity (.75)
Direct Instruction (.60)
Explicit Teaching Strategies (.57)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When teachers make the content and literacy skills visible to students by explicitly modeling through think aloud demonstrations, use of exemplars, anchor charts, etc. students have a clear understanding of what they are being taught and asked to do. In Math, teachers make the content explicit by using teacher and student explanations, representations, and/or examples. Students are given the opportunity to solve problems and build connections amongst strategies and previous knowledge using student explanations and representations. Teachers highlight new learning verbally through student work and or anchor charts.

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.

Instructional Priority and look -fors are identified and communicated to teachers.

Person Responsible: Renel Mathurin (renel.mathurin@hcps.net)

By When: August 15th, 2023

Leadership Team begins walkthroughs to collect and analyze data

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Begin walkthrough process by 1st week of September.

Review trend data monthly with ILT and determine PD to deliver to the staff.

Person Responsible: Kristine Claffie (kristine.claffie@hcps.net)

By When: September 25th ILT Meeting

Review goal of 80% of teachers reaching goal by December.
Determine next steps for Professional Development

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: ILT Meeting on December 18th

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

17% of our students with Disabilities were proficient on the 2022 -2023 FAST Assessment.

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

30% of our Students with Disabilities will achieve proficiency on the 2023-2024 FAST Assessment.

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

Weekly informal assessments will be conducted by the VE teacher to ensure that students are working towards their specific IEP goals in addition to iReady weekly goals to meet individual goals based on needs.
Monthly progress of each student will be reviewed by PSLT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Brown (aimee.brown@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

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.)

iReady Reading will be one of the evidence-based interventions use with SWD. In addition to small group lessons, students will complete 45 minutes of computer based iReady lessons towards their weekly goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady provides students with a computer online path that is based on individual needs in addition to small group lessons used for intervention is a small group setting.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

iReady diagnostic will take place on the second week of September.

Person Responsible: Aimee Brown (aimee.brown@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: All SWD students will be assessed by the third week of September.

Diagnostic results will be reviewed, and students will begin computer based and small group instruction with the VE teacher and Reading Teacher.

Person Responsible: Renel Mathurin (renel.mathurin@hcps.net)

By When: By the third week of September.

Monthly progress reviewed and discussed by PSLT.

Person Responsible: Aimee Brown (aimee.brown@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Oct. 23rd, 2023

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American
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.
31% of our Black students were proficient on the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
40% of our Black students will achieve proficiency on the 2023-2024 FAST Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
iReady weekly goals to meet individual goals based on student needs. Monthly progress of students will be reviewed by PSLT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Kristine Claffie (kristine.claffie@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.)
iReady will be one of the evidence-based interventions use with Black students. In addition to small groups lessons, students will complete 45 minutes per week on computer based iReady lessons to work towards their weekly goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
iReady provides students with a computer online path that is based on individual needs in addition to small group lesson sued for intervention in a small group setting.
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 2 - Moderate 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.
iReady diagnostic will take place on week of September 11th.
Person Responsible: Kristine Claffie (kristine.claffie@hcps.net)
By When: All Black students will be assessed by the third week of September.
Monthly progress is reviewed and discussed by PSLT.
Person Responsible: Kristine Claffie (kristine.claffie@hcps.net)
By When: October 23rd

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).

The school leadership team reviewed the school wide data to determine the funding allocations to ensure that resources are allocated based on needs. Title 1 funds will be allocated to hire two teacher leaders. Both of these units will provide additional support to students with targeted small group intervention.

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

Students will be assessed in August and September using baseline assessments. Data will be analyzed in PLCs to ensure students receive targeted interventions based on needs through the MTSS process. Foundation skills lesson will be implemented within the ELA block to ensure student learning gaps are targeted early. Students will use iReady Reading to provide additional targeted interventions support. Data will be tracked every two weeks during PLCs to ensure student's needs are met.

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

Students will be assessed in August and September using baseline assessments. Data will be analyzed in PLCs to ensure students receive targeted interventions based on needs through the MTSS process. Foundation skills lesson will be implemented within the ELA block to ensure student learning gaps are targeted early. Students will use iReady Reading to provide additional targeted interventions support. Data will be tracked every two weeks during PLCs to ensure student's needs are met.

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 students scoring in proficient range will increase to a minimum of 55% as measured by end of the year STAR Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students scoring proficient will increase to 55% as measured by the FAST.

Monitoring

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

iReady diagnostic assessments will take place in September, January and May.
PLCs will monitor and analyze data every two weeks.
Wonders unit assessment will also be analyzed to monitor progress.
DIBLES Assessment will also be used to monitor progress biweekly.
Teaches will also give weekly phonics assessments UFLI to monitor progress from weekly lessons and determine small group needs..

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mathurin, Renel, renel.mathurin@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?

Students will use iReady Reading in K-5 on a daily basis as part of their reading rotation. Students who have phonics deficiencies will receive additional small group instruction. This is an addition to the grade level core curriculum provided using the Wonders Curriculum and iReady toll box resources, UFLI and DIBELS.

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?

The evidence-based programs are matched to the reading area of need for students with reading deficits based on their diagnostics assessment.
iReady toolkit lessons have been proven to be successful and are research based. They will be used for goal setting and student data chats.

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 Literacy Team (PSLT) will identify students who are not reading on grade level and develop schedule for intervention. The team will analyze diagnostic results to develop a plan of action for intervention. The team will sort, and group students based on needs and identify intervention. The Team will analyze data every six weeks for each grade level to determine MTSS next steps and response to interventions.	Mathurin, Renel, renel.mathurin@hcps.net
Region 3 Literacy Coach will provide coaching support through collaborative planning and coaching sessions to ensure fidelity of interventions. Modeling of lessons will be a focus during implementation...	Mathurin, Renel, renel.mathurin@hcps.net
Assessment will take place to ensure students are making progress. After each diagnostic or progress monitoring periods, data analysis will take place during PLCs to ensure students are receiving targeted small group instruction based on specific needs. Assessments will also be used to assist with data chats with students and goal setting.	Mathurin, Renel, renel.mathurin@hcps.net
Professional Learning Needs will be determined based on Walk-through Data and student needs. UFLI professional learning was a focus during preplanning for teachers. Ongoing coaching and job-embedded professional learning opportunities will be determined by the Instructional Leadership Team.	

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.

Information about Seffner's SIP is available on the school website (https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/seffner). We also disseminate information regarding the SIP process to all stakeholders through our monthly SAC Meetings. News will also be shared with our families and community stakeholders through social media, school newsletters, in both print and electronic forms.

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))

The school website is found on (https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/seffner). Seffner Elementary works in conjunction with SAC/PTA to promote a positive school-home experience for all stakeholders. A calendar of events has been generated to engaged family in our school program and to promote positive relationships with families. Hispanic Heritage Month Program, Black History Month, Octoberfest just to name a few.

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 plan to focus on the following instructional priorities to strengthen the academic program and increase student achievement.
Employing instructional strategies that allow students to master grade level benchmark. Instructional practices that consist of modeling ang direct instruction, check for understanding and differentiated small groups. A focus on benchmark-aligned instruction will be addressed during collaborative planning session to ensure a robust core instruction is implemented daily.

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))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$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