
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Springhead Elementary School

3208 NESMITH RD, Plant City, FL 33566

[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.

Leading to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

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
McClellan, Michelle	Principal	Administrator - Oversees School Improvement Processes, Supports School Improvement Team decisions and implementation
Magann, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Administrator - Supports School Improvement Processes
Govreau, Kelly	SAC Member	SAC Chair, Collaborates on School Improvement Plan, Initiates and coordinates SAC Meetings

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 following stakeholders met to review data and the previous school improvement plan to brainstorm ideas for the 23-24 school year - how to eliminate barriers and support student success: Michelle McClellan, Jennifer Magann, Hayley Judah, Soraya Flores, Melissa Custodio, Brandie Palmer, Brandi Crampton, Amanda Brennan, Tajaney Pinnock, and Carmela Rademacher.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored regularly by the instructional leadership team as we use the assessment plan to progress monitor student achievement and surveys to gather feedback from stakeholders to plan for ongoing professional development, family engagement opportunities and adjustments to student interventions.

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	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	6	52	33	25	24	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	33	29	0	0	0	62
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	18	17	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	29	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	17	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	33	29	0	0	0	62

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	1	2	8	0	0	0	11

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	7	15	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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	35	29	29	36	25	21	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	11
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	30	40	32	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	25	23	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	30	40	32	0	0	0	102

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	14	1	1	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	12	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	35	29	29	36	25	21	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	11
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	30	40	32	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	25	23	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	30	40	32	0	0	0	102

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	14	1	1	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	12	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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*	41	50	53	41	53	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				56			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			48		
Math Achievement*	59	56	59	61	50	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				62			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			47		
Science Achievement*	43	50	54	42	59	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	59	59	58			48		

* 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	243
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

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	422
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	2	1
HSP	43			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	44			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	54			

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	71			
PAC				
WHT	52			
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	41			59			43					55
SWD	21			35			24				5	50
ELL	37			51			30				5	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			35							2	
HSP	38			54			34				5	53
MUL	50			86							2	
PAC												
WHT	47			68			56				4	
FRL	36			54			36				5	54

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	41	56	48	61	62	54	42					58
SWD	18	46	47	41	52	43	21					39
ELL	34	59	52	54	60	60	29					58
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	18			45								
HSP	39	61	56	60	62	56	39					59
MUL	67			75								
PAC												
WHT	43	49	35	63	65	57	50					
FRL	37	54	43	58	59	53	43					59

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	41	39	48	56	43	47	33					48
SWD	11	22	31	41	37	46	20					35
ELL	31	39	33	50	43	40	17					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	14			36								
HSP	38	45	39	54	45	44	21					48
MUL	62			69								
PAC												
WHT	47	34		61	42	50	51					
FRL	37	39	48	54	40	41	25					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	42%	53%	-11%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	46%	-4%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	47%	-7%	51%	-11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component with the lowest performance on the 2022 FSA was in ELA. The greatest barrier was students' lack of foundational skills as they entered third grade. This has been an ongoing trend for several years.

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

While there was not a decline from the 2021 to 2022 FSA in ELA, there was also not an increase in proficiency. There is a clear need to address the gap in foundational skills in the primary grades in order to improve student achievement in the intermediate grades.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap between Springhead's 2022 FSA and the state was in ELA. Though the state is only showing 53% proficiency within ELA, showing a comprehensive need for greater student success in reading, Springhead is currently 12% below the state average with a 41% proficiency in third-fifth grade ELA. This has been an ongoing trend for the state and Springhead, again defining the overwhelming need for a shift in foundational reading instruction in the early grades.

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

Springhead's greatest area of improvement was in math. We increased our proficiency by 5%, going from 56% in 2021 to 61% in 2022. Consistent data driven meetings and focused planning sessions supported an ongoing high level of differentiated support for students. The structures in place and consistency with planning sessions and job-embedded professional development were key actions taken. Each year, we work to refine our practices with differentiating instruction to meet students' individual needs based on their ongoing progress monitoring.

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

A great concern for Springhead students is the lack of consistent attendance. Since 2020, attendance rates have declined; therefore, creating a focus area for 23-24 school year.

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

- K-5 reading instruction
- K-5 science instruction
- Sub-group gains across content areas
- Student attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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 core instruction through differentiation and vocabulary development across content areas – Reading, Writing, Math, Science

Measurable Outcome:

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

Given student need across grade-levels, our staff will consistently implement differentiated instruction by using supplemental units, technology, instructional materials, and professional development to increase reading proficiency (41%) and learning gains (56%), math proficiency (61%) and learning gains (62%) and science proficiency (42%) based on Florida State Assessments in 2024 by 5% in each area.

Monitoring:

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

Ongoing progress monitoring using monthly common assessments and diagnostics for I-ready, STAR and FAST will be used to monitor student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@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.)

Job-embedded Professional Development

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the journal article, "Job-embedded Professional Learning Essential to Improving Teaching and Learning in Early Education" by Debra Pacchiano, Ph.D., Rebecca Klein, M.S., and Marsha Shigeyo Hawley, evidence-based research supports peer learning groups, coaching cycles, and lesson studies because of their ability to increase knowledge development, collaboration routines and transfer to practice supports, which will in turn, equip all classrooms with highly effective teachers.

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.

Resource teachers in reading, math and science will focus on modeling in the classroom, lesson planning, data reviews with teachers, school-wide communication of curriculum events, and small group instruction with students. These supports will take place from August, 2023 to May, 2024.

Person Responsible: Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Instructional Materials will be acquired to support core instruction and differentiated interventions.

Person Responsible: Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Effective communication is used to engage stakeholders in order to increase student achievement in all areas. Weekly updates are sent out through a variety of means beginning in August, 2023 and going through May, 2024.

Person Responsible: Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

By When: August 1, 2023

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Student attendance has been significantly impacted since the circumstances that occurred in 2020 with the fear of disease control. In addition, attendance is impacted negatively by lack of parental involvement and commitment to education. Sometimes that view of education is reflected in the students, and they lack motivation to be present and engaged.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the Springhead average daily attendance rate from 91.6% to 93% as reported on the June 2024 yearly average attendance report.

Monitoring:

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

We will review the MTSS for attendance protocol with staff and check for understanding and implementation of proper absence reporting procedures. We will monitor attendance biweekly within our problem-solving leadership team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Magann (jennifer.magann@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.)

Family engagement

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the article, "Fifteen Effective Strategies for Improving Student Attendance and Truancy Prevention" by Jay Smink, D.Ed. and Mary S. Reimer, Ph.D., research consistently finds that family engagement has a direct, positive effect on children's achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

We will utilize a Title I aide to enhance regular student attendance, both proactively and with communication to families to support interventions.

Person Responsible: Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

We will implement a proactive attendance plan, such as daily student recognition for being on-time and present, weekly class recognition for 100% attendance for the week, and monthly grade level recognition

for the classes with the best attendance in their grade for the month. These will be used to promote daily attendance and promptness to school.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Magann (jennifer.magann@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

#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.

The underperforming subgroup, students with disabilities, received a 38% of federal index points, which is below the 41% needed to meet state performance levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Springhead will increase the federal index percentage from 38% to 41% for the underperforming subgroup, students with disabilities, on the 2024 state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The underperforming subgroup will be progress monitored with intervention-specific assessments to make adjustments to prescriptive interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@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.)

Differentiated instruction will be used to meet the specific needs of the underperforming subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the journal article, "Differentiated Instruction: A Research Basis", current evidence supports addressing student differences through meeting a variety of learning styles and multiple intelligences. To provide these varied modalities, we need access to personnel, technology, and instructional materials. Implementing differentiated instruction will raise students' confidence and motivation levels by providing curriculum rich with embedded growth mindset. Our area of focus levels the playing field for our lowest 25% through a variety of modalities/learning styles, remediation, and enrichment opportunities.

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.

A subscription to Brain Pop will be used to enhance content connections and vocabulary development for students within the underperforming subgroups.

Person Responsible: Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

A Title I aide will be used to support literacy development for the underperforming subgroups.

Person Responsible: Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

By When: August 10, 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.

The underperforming subgroup, Black/African American students, received a 32% of federal index points, which is below the 41% needed to meet state performance levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Springhead will increase the federal index percentage from 32% to 41% for the underperforming subgroup, Black/African American students, on the 2024 state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The underperforming subgroup will be progress monitored with monthly common assessments to make adjustments to instructional practices.

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.)

Differentiated instruction will be used to meet the needs of the underperforming subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the journal article, "Differentiated Instruction: A Research Basis", current evidence supports addressing student differences through meeting a variety of learning styles and multiple intelligences. To provide these varied modalities, we need access to personnel, technology, and instructional materials. Implementing differentiated instruction will raise students' confidence and motivation levels by providing curriculum rich with embedded growth mindset. Our area of focus levels the playing field for our lowest 25% through a variety of modalities/learning styles, remediation, and enrichment opportunities.

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.

A subscription to Brain Pop will be used to enhance content connections and vocabulary development for students within the underperforming subgroups.

Person Responsible: Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

A Title I aide will be used to support literacy development for students within the underperforming subgroups.

Person Responsible: Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

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).

A team of Springhead stakeholders reviewed academic, behavioral and attendance data, both from EOY 2022 and 2023 and ongoing progress monitoring using the Data Dashboard, EdConnect, and EduData.

Stakeholders determined areas of needed improvement for the current school year as well as trends that have developed over the past three to five years in specific grade levels, content areas and underperforming subgroups.

As the school improvement goals were established, the team determined - within the comprehensive needs assessment - how Title I dollars should be spent to best support the indicated areas of concern.

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 2022-2023 coordinated screening and progress monitoring system data, 36% of students in Kindergarten, 61% of students in 1st grade and 47% of students in 2nd grade scored below the 40th percentile. These percentages are indicators of the percentage of students in each grade level who are not on track to score a proficiency level on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. The 1st and 2nd grade scores were due to students entering a grade already below level which impacted their on grade-level performance and showed a need for acceleration to close the existing achievement gap.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 ELA FAST scores, 56% of students in 3rd grade, 50% of students in 4th grade and 59% of students in 5th grade scored below the 40th percentile. These percentages are indicators of the percentage of students in each grade level who are not on track to score a proficiency level on the

statewide, standardized ELA assessment. This score was due to students entering a grade already below level which impacted their on grade-level performance and showed a need for acceleration 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 percent of grades K-2 students scoring proficient, will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring 2024 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 in ELA will be progress monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments. This data will be used to set individualized goals, plan for instruction, and monitor students' progress toward proficiency.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McClellan, Michelle, michelle.mcclellan@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 a planning structure with ELA grade level teams in grades K-5 that will allow them to internalize the Guiding Question and use it as a basis for backward planning. Within these planning structures, we will incorporate structures and strategies that encourage student discussion, students taking ownership of their work, and active engagement during the ELA block.

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 improvement strategy of providing standard-based planning structures focuses core instruction on developing rigorous and meaningful ELA lessons that are purposeful and engage students in critical thinking and reading strategies that will increase reading proficiency.

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
<p>Provide a school wide professional development using material from the book, <i>Shifting the Balance</i> by authors Jan Burkins and Kari Yates. This book teaches teachers how to use literacy strategies that can be embedded into core instruction and student intervention. Administration will set the expectation that academic vocabulary will be identified, taught, posted, and utilized in every classroom. The professional development will start whole group so that administration can set expectations. Then teachers will split into differentiated groups based on need and teacher leaders will present the strategies as they are used with students in their grade levels. This implementation will span from September, 2023 to April, 2024.</p>	<p>McClellan, Michelle, michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net</p>

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 school improvement plan is highlighted for all stakeholders during Springhead's annual Title I meeting in both English and Spanish. It is also available online and in print for those who wish to peruse the information independently.

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))

Springhead uses a variety of means to support strong communications with stakeholders. A weekly message in both English and Spanish is share audibly and in text, the website has updated events and calendars, surveys are used regularly for stakeholder input, classroom newsletters, flyers and group messages are ongoing, and parent engagement events are planned monthly.

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)

Given student need across grade-levels, our staff will consistently implement differentiated instruction by using supplemental units, technology, instructional materials, and professional development to increase reading proficiency (41%) and learning grains (56%), math proficiency (61%) and learning gains (62%) and science proficiency (42%) based on Florida State Assessments in 2024 by 5% in each area. Resource teachers in each content area - Reading, Math and Science - will focus on modeling in the classroom, lesson planning, data reviews with teachers, school-wide communication of family

engagement events, and small group instruction with students identified to be within an underperforming subgroup.

Accountability measures are used to ensure students receive consistent learning opportunities within their daily schedules and instructional materials are reviewed for alignment to benchmarks.

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))

Springhead's school improvement plan is developed in coordination and integration with Hillsborough County supported materials and instructional guides and assessments in alignment with benchmarks outlined in the BEST standards.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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