

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Westshore 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Westshore Elementary School

7110 S WESTSHORE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33616

[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.

West Shore Elementary is committed to rigorous and individualized instruction in order to achieve high levels of achievement to meet the needs of all students..

Provide the school's vision statement.

West Shore Elementary will create well-rounded students who achieve academic excellence.

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
Florin, Julie	Principal	
Dulin, Wendy	Reading Coach	
Bruce, Kirstin	Assistant Principal	

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.

During preplanning, teachers and admin reviewed the school wide academic and behavior data to determine appropriate goals and action steps. Parent and community surveys were also used to ensure stakeholder input.

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))

Admin and teachers will monitor student data throughout the school year, and preplanned time intervals, to assess student progress towards meeting the goal. Admin will conduct frequent observations to check for implementation strategies and update the SIP if needed.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
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	25	16	13	7	19	0	0	0	80	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	4	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	15	0	0	0	26	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	9

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	25	20	16	20	18	16	0	0	0	115	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4	
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	9	18	13	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	24	23	0	0	0	58	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	7	6	9	18	13	0	0	0	58	

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	2	3	2	4	3	5	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	25	20	16	20	18	16	0	0	0	115	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4	
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	9	18	13	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	24	23	0	0	0	58	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	7	6	9	18	13	0	0	0	58	

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	2	3	2	4	3	5	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	50	53	57	53	56	51		
ELA Learning Gains				56			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42					
Math Achievement*	50	56	59	56	50	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				46			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37					

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	31	50	54	30	59	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	59	59	58			58		

* 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	242
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	22	Yes	1	1
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	2	1
HSP	49			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	35	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	57			
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	53			50			31					48
SWD	18			27			20				3	
ELL	60			73							3	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			26			7				4	
HSP	61			56			43				5	29
MUL	69			69							2	
PAC												
WHT	68			64			47				4	
FRL	38			33			14				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	57	56	42	56	46	37	30					58
SWD	39	28		39	56	50						
ELL	67			69								58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	50	57	35	31	24	8					
HSP	68	52		67	64		33					60
MUL	44	35		44	35		18					
PAC												
WHT	78	72		71	50		53					
FRL	50	53	46	46	43	38	23					53

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	51	58		49	42		38					58
SWD	14			21								
ELL	53			26								58

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			21								
HSP	55	62		43	38		47					54
MUL	41			59								
PAC												
WHT	81			74			70					
FRL	41	52		39	35		29					59

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	54%	53%	1%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	46%	11%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	55%	6%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	59%	-7%	61%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	51%	-22%

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, the component that showed the lowest performance was science. The instructional emphasis for planning and support was placed on math and ELA.

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

Due to last school year being a new test, science was the only comparable common assessment from previous years. From 2022 to 2023, science achievement declined by one point. The lack of understanding in science standards and the emphasis on math instruction contributed to the decline.

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.

Science had the largest gap when compared to the state. The lack of teacher knowledge of grade level standards contributed to the large gap when compared to the state.

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

Reading showed the most improvement last year, this was attributed to close progress monitoring and emphasis on iready.

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

Two areas of concern are the number of students attending school less than 90% of the time and student discipline.

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

1. Attendance
2. Discipline
3. Science
4. Math
5. ELA

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to 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.

Based on the data from state assessments, over time Black students have not scored comparable to their White and Hispanic peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Black students will increase proficiency at the same rate as White and Hispanic peers on the state reading and math assessments during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student growth will be monitored by disaggregating student data into subgroups after each progress monitoring period.

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.)

After disaggregating student data, remediation and acceleration lessons will be planned and implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Remediation and acceleration was chosen to close the achievement gap in the quickest way possible. Targeted instruction will provide students access to learning on their level and making gains to meet grade level benchmarks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

All students will participate in statewide progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible: Kirstin Bruce (kirstin.bruce@hcps.net)

By When: 23-24 school year

During PLCs, teachers will disaggregate data based on subgroups

Person Responsible: Wendy Dulin (wendy.dulin@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

Teachers will plan and implement remediation and acceleration lessons to meet grade level benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Kirstin Bruce (kirstin.bruce@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

#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.

The early warning systems identify student attendance as an area of concern. 80 students had attendance less than 90% last year, effecting their access to grade level instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

90% of our students will be in school 90% or more of the time, for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

1. Classrooms with perfect attendance will be celebrated weekly
2. When students reach 3 absences, the teacher will reach out for a parent conference to address barrier in getting to school regularly
3. When students reach 5 absences, the data processor will reach out for a parent conference to stress the importance of attending school regularly and reduce barriers to attending school regularly
4. When students reach 8 absences, the school social worker will reach out to schedule an in person parent conference with admin to begin an attendance RTI plan to allow the student to get to school on a regular basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Florin (julie.florin@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.)

Attendance monitoring for instructional minutes lost as well as the RTI process for attendance which involved goals and celebrations for attending school regularly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance monitoring for instructional minutes lost as well as the RTI process for attendance which involved goals and celebrations for attending school regularly.

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.

Classrooms with perfect attendance will be celebrated weekly

Person Responsible: Julie Florin (julie.florin@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

When students reach 3 absences, the teacher will reach out for a parent conference to address barrier in getting to school regularly

Person Responsible: Julie Florin (julie.florin@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

When students reach 5 absences, the data processor will reach out for a parent conference to stress the importance of attending school regularly and reduce barriers to attending school regularly

Person Responsible: Julie Florin (julie.florin@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

When students reach 8 absences, the school social worker will reach out to schedule an in-person parent conference with admin to begin an attendance RTI plan to allow the student to get to school on a regular basis.

Person Responsible: Julie Florin (julie.florin@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial**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.

Based on the data from state assessments, over time Multi-Racial students have not scored comparable to their White and Hispanic peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Multi-Racial students will increase proficiency at the same rate as White and Hispanic peers on the state reading and math assessments during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student growth will be monitored by disaggregating student data into subgroups after each progress monitoring period.

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.)

After disaggregating student data, remediation and acceleration lessons will be planned and implemented to target Multi-Racial students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Remediation and acceleration was chosen to close the achievement gap in the quickest way possible. Targeted instruction will provide students access to learning on their level and making gains to meet grade level benchmarks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

All students will participate in statewide progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible: Kirstin Bruce (kirstin.bruce@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

During PLCs, teachers will disaggregate data based on subgroups

Person Responsible: Wendy Dulin (wendy.dulin@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

Teachers will plan and implement remediation and acceleration lessons to meet grade level benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Julie Florin (julie.florin@hcps.net)

By When: 23/24 school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Based on school data, we allocated our school improvement funding to include a reading coach, additional reading materials to support grade level instruction, additional math materials to support grade level math instruction, and science materials to support school wide long term investigations and 5th grade hands on experiences.

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

Through weekly planning, instructional coach will guide teachers through planning for daily objectives, task alignment, and success criteria for day-to-day instruction. This will also include common assessments to monitor student progress towards measurable outcomes, as well as targeted scaffolded questions to use during instruction. During grade level PLCs, teachers will review student data to make instructional decisions for remediation and acceleration.

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

Through weekly planning, instructional coach will guide teachers through planning for daily objectives, task alignment, and success criteria for day-to-day instruction. This will also include common assessments to monitor student progress towards measurable outcomes, as well as targeted scaffolded questions to use during instruction. During grade level PLCs, teachers will review student data to make instructional decisions for remediation and acceleration.

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

Considering student data from the 22-23 school year, students in grade K-2 will achieve 65% proficiency by May 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Considering student data from the 22-23 school year, students in grade 3-5 will achieve 65% proficiency by May 2024.

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.

Student proficiency data will be monitored using frequent Dibels assessments, as well as PM1, PM2, and PM3 data throughout the year.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Florin, Julie, julie.florin@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?

Evidenced based practices and programs being used:

1. Early reading interventions
2. Dibels
3. Iready
4. Content focused coaching

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 practices and programs selected have a strong evidence based effect size on student achievement.

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
Literacy Leadership - school wide instructional decisions based on current student data and teacher clarity.	Dulin, Wendy, wendy.dulin@hcps.net
Literacy Coaching will be used to improve teacher clarity to better understand the demands of the reading benchmarks	Dulin, Wendy, wendy.dulin@hcps.net
Based on data from literacy leadership and literacy coaching, the literacy team will provide professional learning through job embedded PD, side-by-side coaching, and differentiated coaching.	Florin, Julie, julie.florin@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP and school wide program plan will be disseminated to parents and families through various avenues, the SAC team, PTA meetings, parent newsletters, and parent conferences.

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))

During the 23/24 school year, we will hold two parent conference nights, one open house, monthly SAC meetings, quarterly PTA meetings, and monthly parent nights.

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)

Through school wide incentives and close progress monitoring, student attendance and behavior will improve, allowing students more time in class, on learning activities.

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))

During the 23/24 school year, West Shore is identified as a CEP school, allowing all students to receive free breakfast and lunch at school. Also, we have headstart and VPK on campus to encourage early childhood learning. Our school social worker also provides access to community resources and supplements for families in need to break down barriers to accessing education.