

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Summerfield Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[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.

Students of Summerfield Elementary will become educated, responsible, and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Summerfield Elementary we aspire to provide a safe, caring, orderly, and respectful environment where every child can reach his/her potential.

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
Alfano, Carmine	Principal	Maintain school safety, instructional leader, implements and maintains high quality instruction using district adopted curriculums. Communicates school-wide data to PSLT and stakeholders. Progress monitors academic success, attendance, and discipline. Hire high quality personnel to meet the multi-cultural needs of the school. Establishes a collaborative culture utilizing SEL and Restorative practices to include all stakeholders.
Woods, Jodie	Assistant Principal	Oversees instructional materials and testing compliance, Maintain school safety, instructional leader, implements and maintains high quality instruction using district adopted curriculums. Communicates school-wide data to PSLT and stakeholders. Progress monitors academic success, attendance, and discipline. Hire high quality personnel to meet the multi-cultural needs of the school. Establishes a collaborative culture utilizing SEL and Restorative practices to include all stakeholders.
BonannoAkel, Judith	SAC Member	SAC Chair. Organizes and facilitates SAC committee meetings, classroom teacher in Fifth-grade with strong ELA strategies to share schoolwide. Mentors new teachers to the school.
Bondoc, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Represents Second Grade in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brought ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve.
Simpson, Karen	Reading Coach	Create high quality coaching sessions for all teachers in grades K-5 and ESE. Progress monitors all ELA and writing data that is intertwined within the curriculum instructional frameworks. Provide trends of reading success and deficits to the PSLT on a regular basis. Implement and lead professional development that increases instructional capacity for all ELA teachers. The Literacy Champion of the school who monitors resources and trends within the literacy program to improve the love for reading and writing. Implementation of the new UFLI phonics and DIBELS progress monitoring tools.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Debrocke, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Represents Third Grade in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brought ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve. Oversees third-grade retention and promotion documentation in the Spring.
Hill, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	Supports onboarding of new KG teachers to the team. Represents Kindergarten in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brings ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve. Facilitates the use of UFLI into the phonics block of ELA at the KG level.
Maynard, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	Represents Fifth Grade in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brought ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve. Facilitates grade level ELP for Science spring state exam with strategic standards-based implementation of interventions during 6 focused sessions.

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.

SAC Committee input into budget expenditures and schoolwide goals are captured in the spring. Title, I impact survey data also allows us to develop parent and community needs that best serve our population. Three business partners (Darrell Herbert, Jennifer Waskovich, and Thomia Thompson) actively engage in schoolwide functions and decisions that best support our diverse population. Community member (Nicholas Cisneros) supports schoolwide events through the support of his mother who also was a prior Summerfield stakeholder the past 25 years. Parents (Jeffrey Beltran and Nakia Sturup) have provided valuable input on how we utilize our funds to enhance academic areas and improve technology. We also use valuable insight survey data from the staff and stakeholders who participate to make surgical improvements on our goals and objectives for this upcoming school year. Once target move has been the implementation of PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Supports) that was a direct result of our behavior data the prior year. We also have targeted improving our visual

technology supports in the remaining classrooms that need the Newline 75' boards to project lessons and learning tools. Lastly, the declining math scores over the past four years have resulted in targeting funds to acquire a Math Resource Teacher fulltime to support math lessons K-5 schoolwide.

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 I.L.T. team will use current data in planning to focus on gaps in instruction that need Tier 2 and Tier 3 immediate attention. Schoolwide Tier 1 targets will drive 2 of the 4 PSLT (Problem Solving Leadership Team) meetings that look at schoolwide academic implementation and trends that impact each grade level.

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	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) 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: B 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	2	57	47	37	32	30	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	46	21	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	43	0	27	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	20	27	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	26	35	0	0	0	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	9	11	7	20	27	0	0	0	79

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	5	13	17	0	0	0	38

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	5	9	11	7	1	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	1	43	46	38	26	38	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	21	30	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	23	340	0	0	0	392
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	5	18	21	0	0	0	0	52

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	4	2	2	13	2	1	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	20
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	1	43	46	38	26	38	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	21	30	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	23	340	0	0	0	392
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	5	18	21	0	0	0	0	52

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	4	2	2	13	2	1	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	20
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*	45	50	53	50	53	56	48		
ELA Learning Gains				63			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			50		
Math Achievement*	49	56	59	51	50	50	40		
Math Learning Gains				69			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			43		
Science Achievement*	61	50	54	45	59	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	51	59	59	52			34		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	250
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
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	44			
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	61			
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	46			
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	52			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	53			

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	45			49			61					51
SWD	35			47			29				5	69
ELL	25			40							4	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			37			46				4	
HSP	39			46			56				5	51
MUL	52			62			73				3	
PAC												
WHT	54			56			70				4	
FRL	38			41			55				5	47

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	50	63	62	51	69	60	45					52
SWD	36	46	42	40	57	47	37					62
ELL	37	63	53	44	55	42	25					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	47		34	50	50	30					
HSP	45	60	57	45	68	57	31					51
MUL	60	74		57	71		67					
PAC												
WHT	63	70		64	75		67					
FRL	44	59	62	44	65	59	38					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	48	45	50	40	47	43	39					34
SWD	33	32	36	29	32	33	37					
ELL	16	38	70	28	40	38	14					34
AMI												
ASN				90								
BLK	41	33		27	50		31					
HSP	32	36	54	29	42	44	21					39
MUL	59			41								
PAC												
WHT	72	65		57	52		69					
FRL	42	40	50	33	43	45	34					37

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	48%	53%	-5%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	37%	46%	-9%	50%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	59%	-5%	61%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	53%	-2%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	51%	8%

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.

Once again, content specific vocabulary across all grade levels and subjects will be a strong focus based on diagnostic I-Ready data that exhibits this shortfall. Grade 3 proficiency dropped to 43% across the grade level. This is directly attributed to the lack of foundational skills in decoding acquired in the early primary grades. The ability to orally sound out letters and blends has been consistent across all grade levels in the primary grades. Our Math proficiency across grades 3-5 stayed the same at 51% schoolwide.

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

ELA proficiency went from 50% to 43% from the prior year. The impact of decoding and and the lack of sound systems in the early primary grades is the key factor based on progress monitoring data like I-Ready, district assessments, and running records. ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 is still below the RAISE platform target of 50%. This area will be our immediate focus this year.

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

Grade 3 and grade 4 math had a minus 9 and minus 7 proficiency level compared to the State after PM 3. Grade 5 maintained with the state average. In ELA grade 3 was minus 13 % below the state average, grade 4 was 12% below the state average and grade 5 was 3% below the state average. We have dedicated a tremendous number of resources towards fixing deficiencies in ELA skills over the intermediate grade levels. The impact of the lack of vocabulary development across subject areas has really shown its impact on grade 3 and 4 proficiency levels. We are trending up in grade 5 with a tremendous amount of early intervention focus in grade 3 and 4. Another contributing factor is our decrease in attendance the past year. We have had more late arrivals and early sign-outs due to a variety of reasons.

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

Our grade 5 Science proficiency showed a gain of 14% proficiency from 45% to 59%. Our most critical action was to target long term investigations throughout grade 5, but also installing them into other grades based on the guidance of the district Science department. We also were more deliberate with data analysis in all grades after we implemented district mini assessments to focus on misconceptions in learning. Once again, we used a 6-week intervention target before state testing to remediate and misconceptions in the path of science development with our grade 5 students. The addition of district resources and the leadership of our science district lead kept our teachers on pace and targeted as the calendar year progressed. This pacing and touch-in approach kept all grade level teachers targeted. In grade 5, we also had one science teacher lead most of the teaching in those five classes. This year we are using a quad scheduling model to have one teacher target science in our four grade five classrooms.

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

Two areas of concern arise from the EWS data. Our discipline calls have greatly increased from the prior year. Our out of school suspensions are about the same, however the number of support calls to the main office and the data collected to support teachers in the classrooms can be attributed to a few factors. Parent support with classroom expectations is showing a decline over the prior year. We are enrolling more students from more trauma driven families that has led to a need for more behavioral supports schoolwide. The other main concern is the number of students struggling with basic proficiency levels as they approach grade 3. We had our largest group of portfolio students in grade 3 this past year because they struggled with foundation skills needed to be successful in the state and district assessments. Our realigned focus this year will be on improving school culture regarding behavior and cultural levels of success in each classroom and schoolwide as well as a shift to a new level of phonics work in the primary grades K-3.

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

1. Foundational decoding and blending (phonics/phonemic awareness) development in grades K-3.
2. Increased positive school culture as the direct result of a shift from Conscience Discipline as our Tier 1 schoolwide behavioral target to P.B.I.S. (Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports) to support our changing group of stakeholders.
3. Maintain a laser focus on our science growth using Long-term investigations and data driven PLC sessions to analyze the data as it is presented in a timely manner, especially in grade 5.
4. Elevate math proficiency in all grades, especially 3-5 with the direct implementation of using Title 1 funds to purchase a Math Resource Coach to support all grade level PLC planning sessions and data analysis sessions.
5. Elevate ELA proficiency with sound coaching cycles driven by our Literacy Coach to enhance understanding of all genres and types of text across all grade levels.

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.

The level of school culture data has shown a decline based on district survey data that exhibits the perception of those surveyed seeing the climate at 51% positive. That level has decreased almost 10% points from the prior year district survey. One area of caution is that the number of stakeholders completing the survey has significantly decreased from the prior year. The most direct result of this is our elevated discipline response date we collect through the school to see how many calls are required to support teachers quarterly. The total number of classroom behavior calls for the year was 1111. Over 260 + quarterly calls has been the average with more calls increasing as the school year progresses.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Switching from Conscience Discipline as our former Tier 1 behavior support to P.B.I.S. will allow teachers more time to teacher and students to feel more connected and safer within the perception of their learning environments. Our goal is to decrease office calls for classroom support by 50% this entire year. In order to do so the complete buy-in of the faculty (16 new teachers) will directly impact this aggressive goal.

Monitoring:

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

Office recorded daily data will be analyzed at P.S.L.T. (Problem solving leadership team) meetings monthly and discussed with the entire faculty quarterly in staff meetings. Also, more attention to coaching teachable managed behaviors in the classroom will decrease some frivolous calls from less skilled teachers in the area of behavior management.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jodie Woods (jodie.woods@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.)

Positive Behavior Intervention Supports implementation based on schoolwide Professional Development. This conceptual change of programming with Tier 1 behavior has shown a .99 impact rating based on John Hattie's work of effect size changes in student learning based on targeted interventions and trainings across a schoolwide system.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With Rti data that has shown a direct need to improve on behavior systems and classroom calls for support, which then allows teachers to focus on academics over behavior management in the classroom. Supporting this need to elevate student/teacher culturally levels and implementing a new system of supporting students for the behaviors we want to see more of the impact effect size should reduce calls to the office and the leadership team. By tackling the Rti focus and the schoolwide cultural perception the effect impact on the Rti data is sizeable at about 1.29 effect impact on learning. The change in Tier 1 behavioral supports can elevate up to .99 effect impact on student learning. The key component is the overall buy-in of the staff and the professional development of training them in pre-planning and throughout the year.

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.

Collaborative summer planning (July of 2023) to launch the change of Tier 1 behavioral supports using P.B.I.S. as the schoolwide system to motivate students to make positive choices in all school settings. Each member invited to roll-out the planning for this implementation was provided with P.B.I.S. resources to preview before the initial implementation PLC this past July.

Person Responsible: Jodie Woods (jodie.woods@hcps.net)

By When: Initial collaboration did result in the summer month of July with the input of a variety of teachers with prior P.B.I.S. experience from prior schools they taught in.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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 utilization of Title 1 funds to allocate a literacy coach to focus on coaching cycles, but more specifically the implementation of the UFLI (University of Florida Institute) to focus on the fidelity of launching the use of phonics instruction and progress monitoring using DIBELS 8. ELA proficiency has decreased in the many grades from the prior year. Most notably grade 3 and 4. As students' progress to the intermediate grades the need to decode impacts not only ELA, but also math and science assessments and student development of key comprehension skills in those grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

One key outcome is to see a decrease by 25% in the number of retentions in grade 3 based on PM 3 data in the spring of 2024. Also, an increase of 7% in proficiency in grades 3-5 to elevate over the 50% level established by the RAISE doctrine. Our current schoolwide proficiency level is 43% this prior year and significantly below the state average.

Monitoring:

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

The initial step was to have teachers have buy-in into the UFLI and DIBELS 8 summer and fall trainings so that they get coached on the strength of the program based on longitudinal data collected by the University of Florida Reading Center. The learned to the science of reading based on that data then must be monitored as it is being used from the onset of this school year, especially in grade k-2. Classroom walkthroughs by administration and data collection on the use of the program will be collected and discussed with actionable feedback to each teacher in those targeted grades. Coaching cycles and additional PD will be provided throughout the year by the Literacy Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Simpson (karenm.simpson@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.)

The use of a repeated reading implementation based on Hattie's effect size impact on student achievement shows that a .75 impact would result if a new targeted implementation for reading is used and checked for fidelity through the implementation and progress monitoring of its impact of student ELA learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A huge state, district, and school dip in ELA proficiency and decoding data as the result of COVID and other societal factors is showing its impact on students and their ability to decode, sound, and blend letters in order to access their grade level text. The impact is showing this effect in grade 3 students who are struggling with content vocabulary, fluency checks, and overall comprehension assessments not only in ELA, but in Science and Math.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

As far as our Title 1 funds: The allocation of a Literacy Coach and a Math resource lead will directly impact proficiency levels in ELA, Math, and indirectly in Science. Student and teacher supply money directly related to resources needed to launch the implementation of the P.B.I.S. system and the UFLI reading phonics program has direct impact of student success in grades K-5 moving forward this year. Family engagement funds to produce packets and work for supporting UFLI will directly impact the fidelity of this new foundational skills attack on literacy. The purchase of 15-17 Newline Interactive teacher screens will enhance learning and allow students and teachers to interact with critical components of the Tier 1 core instruction supports in each subject area.

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

Two major focus areas will center around the implementation of UFLI with its fidelity being monitored with DIBELS. We will also use strategic assessments in I-Ready to establish foundational lessons that can be used by teachers to supplement instruction when differentiated opportunities arise in grades K-2. The reintroduction of using oral walls to elicit the 44 sounds all beginning readers must master is the focus point of our KG instruction moving into grade 1. There is a lot of students in grade 2 that still lack

letter/sound recognition development that we feel we can address and close the gap with sound coaching by our literacy coach and staff PD as we roll out the UFLI science of reading concepts.

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

The extension of UFLI may permeate into grade 3 because many students benefited from the lowering of the portfolio requirement in order to pass into grade 4. The extensive surgical targeting of vocabulary development that is content specific will be the driving force for support in grades 4 and 5. Extended Learning Tutoring, small group lunch buddies, and after school daycare groups will be utilized to add additional time repairing key vocabulary and content specific support the writing and reading development of those students who fall below the proficiency level of 3 in grades 3-5. In grade 3 we only achieved 39% who scored above the 40th percentile based on RAISE data released. Grade 4 was 44% and grade 5 was 50%. The implementation of Reading Counts as an Independent resource for students to use during Media library time will also enhance the practice of more independent reading for students after grade 2. Diagnostic data from I-Ready will target areas of concern for students so that we can use independent lessons from I-Ready to control the student path of learning during center rotations and word work small group instruction.

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

Although grade KG has 52% above the threshold, grades 1 at 50% and grade 2 at 58% fell short of the benchmark needed. Because our STAR data did not pop last spring, our schoolwide shift to the UFLI program was universally agreed upon by our Primary and a few Intermediate teachers. Our goal is to elevate each grade level at least 10% in growth this upcoming school year. The purchasing of tools for UFLI have been purchased and distributed to all KG-2 grade teachers who attended the summer training to use UFLI and DIBELS. The expectation is that by the end of September, all primary teachers will have these trainings. Administration took the training this summer and our ELP Tutor and Literacy coach have also been trained.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3 scored only 39% of the students above the 4th Percentile. Grades 4 were 44% and grade 5 50%. With grade 5 moving on to middle school, our focus is rich content specific vocabulary development with high quality grade level and subject level planning using district created and teacher created mini assessments to progress monitor proficiency of standards being taught. Seventy-five % of all ELP dollars are designated towards our rising students in grades 3-5 who fell below the 40th percentile listed on the RAISE data report. Our schoolwide ELA proficiency for grades 3-5 last year dropped to 43% proficient. Our measurable goal for this year in those grades is above 50 for level 3 achievement in the spring state assessment period.

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.

Two focus areas will drive the progress monitoring of the outcomes desired. DIBELS will be the driving force in primary classrooms to monitor the impact and fidelity of the UFLI implementation and best practices. This will also include walk through feedback to teachers from the Literacy Coach, administration, and district supports throughout the year. The second focus area will be driven from STAR and FAST data the first two assessment windows so tiered needs at each grade level band can be addressed first at PSLT leadership meetings and then ILT grade level discussions that impact Tier 1 Core instruction. To support this, we also embedded the allocation of Title 1 dollars to free up teachers to do learning walks in model classrooms that exhibit the best practices in ELA and UFLI implementation we are desiring for all our teachers.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Alfano, Carmine, carmine.alfano@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?

UFLI is an evidence-based program from the University of Florida reading institute that has gathered longitudinal data the past 10 years. This explicit and systematic phonics program created and researched by Holly Lane and Valentina Contesse has shown great gains in surrounding districts across Florida over the past 10 years. The scope and sequence are designed to ensure that students systematically acquire each skill needed and learn to apply each skill with automaticity and confidence as they learn to decode and read words. The sequencing of steps and lessons provide a logical progression to build student proficiency and confidence. Students enjoy both the predictable routine of the lessons and the variations that the teacher designs based on individual needs.

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?

This program was chosen because of its Research-based elements of language that must be addressed and the methods that are used in scope and sequence to address the automaticity needed for these foundational phonics skills. Phonics has been the one common denominator to early literacy development that has been lacking in our program.

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
Hire a literacy coach to do model lessons, data dive with grade level data, and support side-by-side modeling of best practices. Implement schoolwide DIBELS implementation support in the primary grades. Supplement district and state data with supplemental data like I-Ready to isolate learning gaps needed to be addressed with tutoring and teacher driven lessons within the I-Ready toolkit. This person also drives the ELP tutoring in conjunction with the Assistant Principal.	Woods, Jodie, jodie.woods@hcps.net
Summer training in UFLI (phonics) and DIBELS (progress monitoring tool). The goal is to get 100% implementation started with fidelity and progress monitoring use by the second quarter of the school year.	Simpson, Karen, karenm.simpson@sdhc.k12.fl.us

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.

A variety of rollouts will be used to share this SIP plan to our stakeholders. Staff presentation of the goals and implementations were discussed in pre-planning and posted for review for 3 days to provide input. SAC committee will review staff vote and the plan to initiate a vote at the end of August. The annual title 1 meeting at the end of August will review the school goals and objectives to implement this plan.

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 initial switch to P.B.I.S. will elevate the culture of the school with the students and staff on a daily basis. The increased use of academic nights for parents, family cultural events and targeted parent link messaging will keep all stakeholders actively engaged with the school focus if they choose to contribute. Resources to family to support our less fortunate and school functions that are free and induce participation will elevate the positive relationships we already have with our parents and stakeholders. Monthly notification of teachers out of field and how that may impact their child's classroom is mandated and sent home in the first day packet and posted on our district webpage.

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)

By decreasing behavior calls and increasing cultural perceptions, more time will be directed towards high quality standards-based instruction. The implementation of UFLI and DIBELS 8 will target ELA proficiency that has dipped over the past year. High quality coaching sessions by the Literacy coach, math resource teacher purchased out of Title 1 funds will elevate strong PLC planning sessions that will directly impact each grade level Tier 1 instruction.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The plan directly attacks the cultural and academic improvement of the school population by coordinating services that elevate family success and supports those who are in need of resources to meet the goals and objectives of the school. Many of our families are struggling financially and social emotionally in their daily lives. School events, school communication, and school partnerships directly impact and support the reduction in violence and lack of nutritional resources our families are faced with daily. Family engagement and resources driven out of the Title 1 budget allow many homes to access supplies for their children to be successful and blend into the norm of daily school activities.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Through referral data and student services resources many outside agencies are accessed to support student and family mental health initiatives. INVO counseling is one service we use for elevated mental health support for those students who are struggling with ideation and other self-destructive behaviors daily. Whole group grade level counseling is used to prevent district and state programs on drugs, alcohol, and substance abuse programs. The counseling also attacks threats like weapons, bullying, cyber misuse, trafficking and other factors families and students deal with daily,

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Some minor connections are made to setting lifelong goals that will be achieved in postsecondary education, however they are not a huge focus in the elementary grade-levels for our site.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Through the use of MTSS/Rti and the Problem-Solving Leadership Team we meet 3 times per month to look at elevated attendance, behavioral, and academic data as students move through the tiered system of supports our school, district and state can provide. Discipline support that elevated to a threat is also discussed with local law enforcement whenever threats occur, and at least once per month to review prior cases. Academic and attendance tiered support is monitored based on immediate and relevant data that drives wrap around support and Extended Learning Supports the school can offer families. Academic supports are solely based on trends in student and school data.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

This summer we pushed out the UFLI district decoding and phonics training to many teachers. Paraprofessionals and staff were and are being coached on best practices of P.B.I.S. protocols to elevate the cultural and desired outcomes we expect from all students daily while accessing the campus. Strong onboarding sessions and social events to welcome new teachers and promote retention of veteran teachers is an ongoing process with scheduled sessions in the summer for new teachers and social gatherings for the entire faculty to develop strong cultural relationships outside of the classroom and school setting.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Because of our VPK and 2 PEEEPS program classes on our campus, we have the luxury to include those youngsters with some of our KG events and early learning initiatives to make the transition from age 4 to the classroom in KG seamless. It also allows us to prepare our parents for the behavioral and academic expectations of the Primary years in school.

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: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes