

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Wimauma 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 | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 19 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 21 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Wimauma Elementary School

5709 HICKMAN ST, Wimauma, FL 33598

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will provide rigorous Standards' Based Learning in a safe environment where students are valued for who they are as individuals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In All We DO, Students are at the Forefront.

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 |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Fletcher, Karen | Principal | Oversee the full process and implementation of the full SIP process. |
| Gordon, Suzanne | SAC Member | SAC Chairperson |
| Thomas, Lori | Instructional Coach | Provides coaching to instructional staff to impact student academic success. |
| Hollomon, Melissa | Other | Provides instructional support to students and staff to impact student academic success. |
| Ruiz, Daniel | Assistant Principal | Operates as an instructional leader and oversees the logistics of the campus. |
| DeLamota, Susana | Dropout Prevention Coordinator | Supervises ELL Paras and support ELL students across the campus. |
| Davidson, Deborah | Other | Supervises ESE Teachers and Paras and supports ESE students across the campus. |

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.

Our Academic Service Team and SAC works together to complete the School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

The plan will be monitored by stakeholders from our Academic Service Team and Student Services Team along with our School Advisory Council on a Monthly basis. Revisions will be made as necessary based on ongoing data checks.

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 | 90% |
| 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) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 44 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 32 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 60 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184 | |

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

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

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 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 27 | 26 | 24 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 52 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 48 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 27 | 26 | 24 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 52 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 48 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 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* | 26 | 50 | 53 | 29 | 53 | 56 | 31 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 44 | | | 34 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35 | | | 23 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 32 | 56 | 59 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 33 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 59 | | | 34 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51 | | | 41 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 24 | 50 | 54 | 49 | 59 | 59 | 49 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 69 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 56 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 48 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 48 | 59 | 59 | 71 | | | 61 | | |

* 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 | 32 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 161 |
| 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 | 47 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 378 |
| 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 | 11 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 21 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | |
| HSP | 30 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 31 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| FRL | 31 | Yes | 1 | 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 | 34 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 47 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | | | |
| FRL | 48 | | | |

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 | 26 | | | 32 | | | 24 | | | | | 48 |
| SWD | 5 | | | 10 | | | 11 | | | | 5 | 20 |
| ELL | 14 | | | 25 | | | 3 | | | | 5 | 48 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | | | 50 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 25 | | | 30 | | | 20 | | | | 5 | 47 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | | | 36 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| FRL | 25 | | | 30 | | | 19 | | | | 5 | 48 |

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 | 29 | 44 | 35 | 40 | 59 | 51 | 49 | | | | | 71 |
| SWD | 18 | 44 | 29 | 21 | 54 | 42 | 28 | | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 39 | 31 | 37 | 60 | 60 | 49 | | | | | 71 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 30 | 45 | 34 | 41 | 61 | 58 | 53 | | | | | 71 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 29 | 46 | | 47 | 46 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 44 | 38 | 40 | 59 | 51 | 48 | | | | | 73 |

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 | 31 | 34 | 23 | 33 | 34 | 41 | 49 | | | | | 61 |
| SWD | 14 | 10 | | 12 | 15 | | 27 | | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 31 | 28 | 28 | 33 | 44 | 40 | | | | | 61 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | 35 | 25 | 32 | 34 | 45 | 49 | | | | | 60 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 14 | | | 40 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 35 | 23 | 32 | 34 | 41 | 49 | | | | | 61 |

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 | 28% | 53% | -25% | 54% | -26% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 54% | -30% | 58% | -34% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 46% | -16% | 50% | -20% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 55% | -24% | 59% | -28% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 59% | -24% | 61% | -26% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 53% | -21% | 55% | -23% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 47% | -23% | 51% | -27% |

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.

Science showed the lowest performance and decreased in proficiency. 2021-2022: 49% of 5th graders scored a level 3 or higher and in 2022-2023 only 24% scored a level 3 or higher. Our teaching staff changed which impacted our scores. Due to unit cuts, one of our 5th grade teachers had to go self-contain, teaching all major content areas of which she had only taught ELA for the past 10 plus years.

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

Science showed the lowest performance and decreased in proficiency. 2021-2022: 49% of 5th graders scored a level 3 or higher and in 2022-2023 only 24% scored a level 3 or higher. Our teaching staff changed which impacted our scores. Due to unit cuts, one of our 5th grade teachers had to go self-contain, teaching all major content areas of which she had only taught ELA for the past 10 plus years.

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 showed the lowest performance and decreased in proficiency. 2021-2022: 49% of 5th graders scored a level 3 or higher and in 2022-2023 only 24% scored a level 3 or higher. Our teaching staff changed which impacted our scores. Due to unit cuts, one of our 5th grade teachers had to go self-contain, teaching all major content areas of which she had only taught ELA for the past 10 plus years.

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

Given this is our first year taking the FAST Assessment, no improvement nor decline can be calculated for either ELA nor Math for this school year.

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

Areas of concern: increasing student proficiency in ELA and improving student attendance.

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

1. Increasing student proficiency in ELA
2. Increasing student proficiency in Science
3. Increasing student proficiency in Math
4. Making learning gains for all students in all content areas.
5. Improving student attendance.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on our 2022-2023 school data, a need for increasing student engagement in all content areas was identified. By addressing instructional practices as related student engage, this will yield an increase in proficiency in reading, math and science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

35% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders will become proficient in reading by May 2023-2024 according to the FAST progress monitoring assessment.

38% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders will become proficient in Math by May 2023-2024 according to the FAST progress monitoring assessment.

29% of our 5th graders will become proficient in Science 2023-2024 according to the FAST progress monitoring assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will be conducted via- Targeted Walk-throughs, PLC data focus meetings, FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments, Quarterly Math and Science Assessments, I-Ready Diagnostics.

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.)

Increasing student engagement via Kagan Structures during core and small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on our 2022-2023 school data, a need for increasing student engagement in all content areas was identified.

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

#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.

Based on school wide data, a need to address attendance was identified.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our attendance from 91% to 97% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year as determined by Ed Connect.

Monitoring:

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

Student Attendance will be monitored on a Weekly and monthly basis by our school social worker by Homeroom classes and by students who have previously missed more than 10% of school during the 2022-2023 school year.

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.)

Check and connect will be used as students are assigned to a check in buddy to create a welcoming environment and to ensure students feel as they belong.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing Check and Connect will help us with monitoring individual students' attendance and support in providing a positive culture and environment.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to 2022-2023 FAST Reading PM 3, 3% (1 student) of our SWD scored a level 3 or higher and in Math 11% (4 students) scored at a level 3 or higher.

Measurable Outcome:

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

According to 2023-2024 FAST Reading PM 3, 8% (3 students) of our SWD scored a level 3 or higher and in Math 16% (6 students) scored at a level 3 or higher.

Monitoring:

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

We will use our current monitoring plan to monitor Push and Watch students and will focus specifically on this subgroup. The Leadership team, classroom teachers, and VE teachers will all know who these students are to monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Fletcher (karen.fletcher@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.)

Based on the student, they will be receiving interventions with Brainspring or Rewards in ELA and i-Ready for Math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Brainspring is an evidence-based program that provides direct, systematic, multisensory instruction focusing on Phonological and Phonics deficits. Rewards is a direct, systematic program that provides instruction focusing on Vocabulary and Comprehension deficits. i-Ready Math is a research-based program to provide instruction to the student's specific deficits based on their lesson path as designed per their diagnostic.

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)).

Title 1 funds are used to fund resource teacher positions including ELA Coach, Math Resource, and RTI Resource. The resource positions work with teachers and students to increase teacher pedagogy and student proficiency and learning gains. They engage teachers in weekly content support, monthly PLCs focusing on knowledge around the benchmarks. As well as coaching cycles to increase student engagement and consistent fidelity checks with walkthroughs. Teach Me Tuesdays were initiated to incorporate ongoing professional development including Kagan and student engagement structures.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on i-Ready, 63% of K students, 64% of first grade, and 63% of second grade are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment. UFLI will be implemented in all ELA classrooms K-2 to help close the achievement gap.

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

73% of 3-5 students scored below a Level 3 on the statewide ELA Assessment. The 73% consists of 75% fifth grade students, 74% fourth grade students, and 70% third grade students. Third and fourth grade students will receive instruction using UFLI in whole group for the first six weeks and then move to small group instruction. Targeted fifth grade students will receive small group instruction using UFLI.

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

Students meeting proficiency in grades K-2 will increase from 37% to 42% based on Spring 2024 i-Ready Diagnostic.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students meeting proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase from 27% to 32% based on PM3 Fast 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.

We will be monitoring the items through fidelity walkthroughs, data chats, PLCs, formal and informal assessments and progress monitoring. The ILT will use this information to plan for instruction and guide areas for professional development.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fletcher, Karen, karen.fletcher@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Students below proficiency in grades K-5 will receive instruction using UFLI. This program provides direct, explicit, systematic, and multisensory instruction to help close the achievement gap.

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 targets phonics instruction that our students performing below proficiency have deficits in. The effect size for K is 1.2 and 1st grade was 1.42. These were the only two grade levels that were tested.

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 |
|---|---|
| Implement research-based instruction during small group instruction in grades K-5. The literacy coach will be modeling in classroom and participate in side-by-side coaching with teachers. The LLT will conduct implementation walkthroughs to assess the implementation process and drive the focus for Professional Development. | Fletcher, Karen, karen.fletcher@hcps.net |
| Incorporate student engagement strategies across all content areas. Teachers will receive ongoing PD throughout the year about how to incorporate engagement strategies in their classroom, including but not limited to Kagan strategies. | Fletcher, Karen, karen.fletcher@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.

We will have a Parent Night in September/October to share the SIP plan with our stakeholders. We will send the invite through Parent Link, flyers, and through classroom communication Apps.

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))

Our school will have monthly PTA / SAC meetings to share updates, resources, and strategies. We will have an Empowering Parents Program/FACE committee that meets monthly to brainstorm ways to connect with our parents and the community.

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)

PLCs
Content Support
PSLT Meetings
Walkthroughs

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))

Our Head Start Program is supported through our various methods of supporting the academic growth of all students through PLCs, Content Support via our onsite coaches and staff and District Resource Teachers from the Head Start Program.