Woodbridge Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Woodbridge Elementary School

8301 WOODBRIDGE BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[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.

Show our Wildcat PRIDE by:
P- Be a Problem Solver
R- Take Responsibility for my actions
I- Invest care in myself and others.
D- Show Determination to reach my goals.
E- Give my best Effort.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building a Foundation for the Future.

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
Morse, Victoria	Principal	Supervisor of all day-to-day processes on campus. She is also the lead instructional specialist, runs the budget, and gives all final evaluations on teachers and staff.
Lee, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Assessment coordinator, data coordinator, instructional feedback, professional development, discipline, and schoolwide data.
Reinhart, Jackie	Reading Coach	Facilitates planning, data chats, Content PLCs, and student intervention groups, coaching cycles, supports TIP/Top teachers.
Kirkland, Eliana	Other	Schoolwide Behavior and MTSS facilitation
Chacon, Claudia	ELL Compliance Specialist	Oversees all ELL testing, student plans, coordinates parent meetings, manages ELL data.
Kulyik, Lissette	Other	Oversees all ESE activities, PD for ESE, paperwork compliance, MTSS.
Scalzi, Diane	SAC Member	SAC Chair
	Other	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Instructional Leadership Team, Literacy Leadership Team, and SAC utilized the Spring 2023 FAST and STAR data to analyze areas of need and create a strategic 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))

Literacy Leadership and ILT will meet once a month to review data collected during the previous month to identify trends and determine next steps.

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	91%
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: 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	41	15	34	25	21	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	4	1	8	0	0	0	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	47	46	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	42	50	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	52	50	47	0	0	0	149
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	45	56	49	0	0	0	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	54	47	49	20	38	0	0	0	208

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	1	2	18	0	0	0	24

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	6	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	1	27	29	27	25	25	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	58	49	37	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	39	29	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	9	1	0	0	0	0	12
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	27	29	27	25	25	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	58	49	37	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	39	29	0	0	0	74
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	1	2	1	2	18	23	0	0	0	47

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	9	1	0	0	0	0	12
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*	39	50	53	40	53	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				51			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			50		
Math Achievement*	36	56	59	49	50	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				72			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			36		
Science Achievement*	39	50	54	32	59	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	59	59	62			52		

* 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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	195
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
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	22	Yes	1	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	21	Yes	2	2
PAC				
WHT	41			

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%
FRL	39	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	41			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	28	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	69			
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	39			36			39					55
SWD	13			15			24				5	40
ELL	36			36			32				5	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			31							2	
HSP	38			37			37				5	56
MUL	17			25							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	46			35							2	
FRL	40			35			41				5	55

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	40	51	47	49	72	67	32					62
SWD	19	43	45	24	61	63	29					43
ELL	41	51	50	47	73	60	28					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			43								
HSP	40	52	50	48	71	68	31					63
MUL	19	17		25	50							
PAC												
WHT	54	64		71	86							
FRL	38	50	53	49	72	66	32					63

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	41	59	50	39	33	36	38					52
SWD	19	22	18	22	44		33					41
ELL	42	69	62	38	33		39					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			35								
HSP	40	60	53	38	26	25	39					54
MUL	35			22								
PAC												
WHT	44			50								
FRL	41	59	52	39	31	35	37					52

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	43%	53%	-10%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	54%	-21%	58%	-25%
03	2023 - Spring	22%	46%	-24%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	31%	55%	-24%	59%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	30%	59%	-29%	61%	-31%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	53%	-16%	55%	-18%

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.

In 2023, only 34% of students were proficient in Reading, 34% of students were proficient in Math, and 29% of students were proficient in Science. It is evident there is a need for strategic planning around Tier 1 instruction focused on standards aligned tasks.

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

Math proficiency showed the greatest decline from the prior year from 49% proficiency to 34% proficiency. A contributing factor was implementation of a new core curriculum. There were changes in state standards.

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

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average is 3rd grade reading. There were changes in state standards and there has not been a consistent foundational skills structure in primary districtwide. As a school, there is a need for consistent and strategic use of assessments and data to inform instruction.

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

5th grade reading showed the most improvement overall, specifically with students showing movement between PM1 and PM3. Teachers on this grade level exhibit strong content knowledge and maximize their time for planning and instruction.

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

In prioritizing areas of concern, behavior data showed the instructional design (i.e. whole group) prevented students from engaging in high quality instruction in complex tasks that would maintain intellectual engagement.

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

We will prioritize planning using data to inform instruction and develop standards aligned tasks.

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 Collaborative Planning

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

Student achievement will increase through improving overall core instruction focused on standards aligned tasks.

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

Reading proficiency will increase from 34% to 50% proficiency by May 2024 through grade level collaborative planning.

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

Progress monitoring data will be used to identify trends in instructional delivery. Administration will attend planning sessions in Grades 3-5 and utilize a walkthrough tool to monitor implementation of the instructional plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Morse (victoria.morse@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.)

.1. Use of data (formal and informal) to plan for core instruction and increase reading proficiency to monitor progress and give feedback on trends.
2. Use of data (formal and informal) to provide standards aligned tasks during core and small group instruction.

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

Based on Hattie's Research, Collective Teacher Efficacy, such as grade level collaborative planning, will positively affect students. With an effect size 1.57 Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement. Teachers in grade levels will engage in ongoing reflection as a teacher and a learner during grade level collaborative planning, PLC's, and during quarterly data chats with Administration.

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.

Targeted classroom walkthroughs by administration and coaches will be conducted weekly during core instruction to observe implementation of planning and provide actionable feedback to improve instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Lee (kimberly.lee@hcps.net)

By When: May 2024.

Literacy Coach, Reading Resource Teacher, and Math Leadership Team will facilitate weekly grade level planning sessions after school (additional planning time) to plan for core instruction in reading, math and science. This additional planning time will allow coaches and teachers to plan lessons that align with the standards for the grade. Standards aligned tasks will be planned to provide opportunities for students to respond to and build on one another's thinking throughout the lesson to deepen their understanding of the content. The questions, tasks, or assessments planned during this planning time will yield data that allow the teacher to assess students' progress toward learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards and provides for further lesson adjustments. The lesson plans will also include opportunity for teachers to deliberately check for understanding throughout
the lesson and adapt the lesson according to student understanding.

Person Responsible: Jackie Reinhart (jacqueline.reinhart@hcps.net)

By When: May 2024

Literacy Coach will conduct frequent coaching cycles with teachers to improve quality and effectiveness of instruction in whole group and scaffolding strategies to maintain intellectual engagement. The frequency and focus of coaching cycles will be based on tiering of teachers and walkthrough data. These coaching plans will be developed during weekly FOCUS meetings with the academic leadership team.

Person Responsible: Jackie Reinhart (jacqueline.reinhart@hcps.net)

By When: By May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

All faculty, staff and students will participate in PBIS to engage in a school wide culture of high expectations and collaboration.

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

Students with discipline referrals will decrease from 3% to 1 %.

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

The RTI Resource teacher will meet weekly with the Student
Services team to analyze behavior data from Behavior Tracker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eliana Kirkland (eliana.kirkland@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.)

1. Proactive Talking Circles during Morning Meeting 2. Positive
Behavior Support through PBIS Schoolwide Plan.

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

According to Eric Jensen, students in poverty who have
experienced trauma thrive in systems that provide consistent and
reliable structures. He also states that students must be taught how
to interact and cope to achieve success.

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.

Teachers will attend PBIS PD sessions each quarter facilitated by the PBIS Team to strengthen Tier 1 Classroom Management. Classroom Walkthroughs of Tier 1 Classroom Management observables will be conducted at least twice a month to capture evidence of implementation of schoolwide behavior plan. Teachers will receive feedback and the PBIS Team will analyze trends to develop next steps.
RTI Resource Teacher will utilize Behavior Tracker to monitor progress and share data monthly with Faculty.

.

Person Responsible: Eliana Kirkland (eliana.kirkland@hcps.net)

By When: By May 2024

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).

n/a

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

Student achievement in reading will increase to at least 50% proficiency through weekly collaborative planning.

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

Student achievement in reading will increase to at least 50% proficiency through weekly collaborative planning.

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

In 2024 50% of students will be proficient in reading on STAR Literacy Assessments.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In 2024 50% of students will be proficient in reading on FAST Assessments.

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.

Classroom walkthroughs conducted by Administration and Coaches will be used to monitor Tier 1 instruction
and teacher's implementation of planning. Actionable feedback will be given on Microsoft Forms.
Literacy Leadership Team will meet quarterly to review data, facilitate teacher planning sessions, and leverage student data to inform professional learning to impact Tier I instructional decisions. The LLT will utilize the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards along with a collaborative planning protocol to impact instruction. Administration will meet weekly with Literacy Coach to discuss next steps for professional development and individualized coaching support.

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

Morse, Victoria, victoria.morse@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?

Based on Hattie's Research, Collective Teacher Efficacy, such as grade level collaborative planning, will positively affect students. With an effect size 1.57 Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement. Teachers in grade levels will engage in ongoing reflection as a teacher and a learner during grade level collaborative planning, PLC's, and during quarterly data chats with Administration.

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?

These strategies will support the development of high-quality Tier 1 core instruction and deepen teachers'
understanding of grade level content and standards. This will ensure students receive instruction aligned to
the expectations of grade level standards with tasks that challenge them cognitively.

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
Progress monitoring data will be used to identify trends in instructional delivery. Administration will attend planning sessions in Grades K-5 and utilize a walkthrough tool to monitor implementation of the instructional plan. Targeted classroom walkthroughs by administration and coaches will be conducted weekly during core instruction to provide in-the-moment coaching and actionable feedback to improve instructional practice. The Literacy Leadership Team will meet quarterly to build teacher capacity around ELA planning and determine next steps for professional development opportunities based on data. Professional learning will be incorporated to build teacher capacity with planning that is facilitated by the Literacy Leadership Team. Faculty Meetings will provide bite-sized PD with ELA Walkthroughs calendared with State Regional Literacy Director to observe implementation of new learning. Job embedded PD will provide teachers an opportunity to observe colleagues during core instruction.	Lee, Kimberly, kimberly.lee@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.

High expectations for all stakeholders will be established at the beginning of the year. Monthly newsletters to stakeholders will communicate schoolwide initiatives and progress updates towards meeting goals.
The principal will meet with stakeholders (parents, partners, community members) monthly to discuss issues and concerns along with share the school's progress toward meeting the needs of all students. These meetings will provide an opportunity for feedback and collaboration to build partnerships with all stakeholders.

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))

Administration- establish high expectations and support teachers, families and students in meeting them. Parent Academies will be offered throughout the year to provide support and engage families. Teachers will communicate student progress throughout the year to families electronically and provide opportunities to meet at least twice a year for parent conferences. The school will promote open lines of communication with teachers and administration to support students and families.

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)

Coaches and Math Leadership Team will facilitate weekly grade level planning sessions before and after school to plan for core instruction in reading, math and science. This additional planning time will allow coaches
and teachers to plan lessons that align with the standards for the grade or addressing specific skill deficiencies that hold them back from doing grade-level work. Tier 1 instruction will include questions and tasks that provide opportunities for students to respond to and build on one another's thinking throughout the lesson to deepen their understanding of the content. The questions, tasks, or assessments
planned during this planning time will yield data that allow the teacher to assess students' progress toward
learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards and provides for further lesson adjustments. The lesson plans will also include opportunity for teachers to deliberately check for understanding throughout the lesson and adapt the lesson according to student understanding.

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))

N/a

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))

n/a

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))

n/a

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).

n/a

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))

n/a

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))

n/a