
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| 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 | 23 |

Lake Magdalene Elementary School

2002 PINE LAKE DR, Tampa, FL 33612

[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.

Lake Magdalene will provide a safe, dynamic environment that promotes innovation and accountability.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Lake Magdalene every student can excel.

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 |
|---------------|---------------------|---|
| Perez, Ann | Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff, reviews of teachers' activities, and issuance of directives. * Administers and develops educational programs for students with mental or physical disabilities. * Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school. * Establishes and maintains relationships with colleges, community organizations, and other schools to coordinate educational services. * Requisitions and allocates supplies, equipment, and instructional material as needed. * Directs preparation of class schedules, cumulative records, and attendance reports. * Walks about school building and property to monitor safety and security. * Plans and monitors school budget * Plans for and directs building maintenance |
| Sierra, Mandy | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Makes or shares in the making of decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so that actions may be taken and commitments made by self and others. * Acts in accordance with the shared vision and mission of the district and school; cares about the organization's reputation and is aware of the effect his/her decisions make on the organization. * Influences the school stakeholders by a variety of means, such as persuasive argument, setting examples, or using expertise; is able to present ideas to others in an open, informative, and non-evaluative manner; is able to write clearly and concisely. * Uses data to implement curriculum and instructional supervision; gathers, analyzes and uses data from varied and multiple sources to build relationships, form concepts, and create hypotheses; analyzes alternatives and perspectives when solving a problem or making a decision. * Demonstrates readiness to initiate action and takes responsibility for leading and enabling others to improve the circumstances being faced or anticipated. * Organizes cooperatively with staff and other stakeholders to design and implement ways to reach the goals and mission of the school. * Skillfully facilitates others working together effectively; shows concern for diverse perspectives, as well as empathy for other's feelings; is adaptable. |

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.

School Advisory Council invites are sent out the last two months of the previous year. Also, during Open House and throughout the year the meetings are advertised through flyers, Class dojo, the school website, and Parent link. During the meetings members contribute their thoughts and opinions to create

the plan as well as make modifications. The school staff as well as the SAC committee all review and approve the 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))

Each year the plan and its contents are reviewed and evaluated for changes based on the previous year's data. The goals set forth in the plan are based on the instructional priorities within the school. The School Improvement Plan is reviewed and monitored frequently (each 9 weeks), to ensure the goals are still the driving force of work.

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 70% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | 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: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 2 | 37 | 16 | 29 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 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 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 23 | 24 | 13 | 23 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

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 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 | 23 | 24 | 13 | 23 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

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 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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* | 52 | 50 | 53 | 52 | 53 | 56 | 50 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 62 | | | 50 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53 | | | 48 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 56 | 56 | 59 | 63 | 50 | 50 | 65 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 63 | | | 61 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46 | | | 70 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 43 | 50 | 54 | 42 | 59 | 59 | 42 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 69 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 56 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 48 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 60 | 59 | 59 | 58 | | | 66 | | |

* 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 | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 276 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 439 |
| 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 | 15 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 41 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 51 | | | |
| MUL | 58 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 51 | | | |

| 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 | 36 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 53 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | | | |
| HSP | 56 | | | |
| MUL | 64 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

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 | 52 | | | 56 | | | 43 | | | | | 60 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 19 | | | 5 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 32 | | | 32 | | | 20 | | | | 5 | 60 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | | | 36 | | | 14 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 50 | | | 48 | | | 35 | | | | 5 | 58 |
| MUL | 55 | | | 60 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | | | 77 | | | 67 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 46 | | | 49 | | | 33 | | | | 5 | 67 |

| 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 | 52 | 62 | 53 | 63 | 63 | 46 | 42 | | | | | 58 |
| SWD | 12 | 46 | 44 | 35 | 50 | 43 | 22 | | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 66 | 67 | 48 | 65 | 63 | 21 | | | | | 58 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 46 | 55 | 36 | 36 | 40 | 38 | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 66 | 55 | 59 | 70 | 59 | 31 | | | | | 58 |
| MUL | 67 | 64 | | 71 | 55 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 61 | | 77 | 62 | | 59 | | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 58 | 52 | 55 | 61 | 44 | 32 | | | | | 64 |

| 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 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 65 | 61 | 70 | 42 | | | | | 66 |
| SWD | 11 | 39 | | 34 | 71 | 82 | 18 | | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 30 | | 48 | 50 | | 30 | | | | | 66 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 30 | | 46 | | | 40 | | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 45 | 38 | 59 | 57 | 62 | 40 | | | | | 67 |
| MUL | 67 | 80 | | 71 | 80 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 58 | | 79 | 60 | | 39 | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 49 | 50 | 59 | 61 | 67 | 38 | | | | | 67 |

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 | 49% | 53% | -4% | 54% | -5% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 54% | -5% | 58% | -9% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 46% | 13% | 50% | 9% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 55% | 13% | 59% | 9% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 59% | -3% | 61% | -5% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 53% | -8% | 55% | -10% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 47% | -8% | 51% | -12% |

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The area of science scored the lowest with 42%. These scores were due to lack of Professional Learning Communities, Differentiation, and Effective Planning.

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

Math was our greatest decline from 2022 to 2023. This decline was due to inconsistent planning and lack of differentiation.

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 data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Lake Magdalene scored 39% on the 2023 SSA and the state average was 51%. These scores were due to lack of Professional Learning Communities, Differentiation, and Effective Planning.

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

ELA showed the most improvement from 2022-2023. The school utilized a district reading coach for planning sessions that included small group instruction and monitoring usage of district reading programs.

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

Collaborative planning with Content Resource Teachers and small group rotations in the science block.

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

- 1- Science Proficiency
- 2- School Culture and Learning
- 3- Meeting the needs of our students with disabilities

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The area of focus will be related to Early Warning System and improving attendance and Tier 1 behavior. 65 student incidents of mild physical aggression or unwanted contact occurred during the 2022-2023 school year. Attendance at the end of the year showed that 76% of students had a 90% attendance rate. Behavior and attendance directly impact student achievement and a positive school culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By end of the 2023-2024 school year, 85% of students will have a 90% attendance rate or higher, and the behavior incidents will decrease to 25 occurrences or less.

Monitoring:

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

The attendance focus will be monitored by the school social worker and the principal utilizing a shared document in One Drive. Positive attendance incentives will be implemented by the social worker. A Tier 1 Behavior Plan will be developed school wide and positive behavior incentives per grade level will be established for a daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly basis. Both areas will be monitored through EdConnect.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ann Perez (ann.perez@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.)

The evidence-based intervention for behavior is based on the research of PBIS. The link between increased attendance is based on interventions through research from Attendance Works.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie's work on the effect size of student learning can be seen in many areas that both behavior and attendance effect. When students are not in school either due to outside sources or school not being enjoyable, they are unable to do their best. The same with behavior; students must have positive incentives with set rules and expectations school-wide to create 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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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 2023 SSA Science Scores, 42% in 5th grade scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. These scores were due to lack of Professional Learning Communities, Differentiation, and Effective Planning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent 5th grade students scoring at a 3 or higher on the SSA will increase to 50% as measured by 2024 Science SSA.

Monitoring:

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

Student achievement and learning will be monitored using weekly walkthrough trends based on the school's Instructional Priorities as well as the district created Formatives, PMA's, common mini assessments. Student progress will be analyzed by the school's electronic data wall and instruction will be strategically delivered based on needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ann Perez (ann.perez@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.)

Develop checks for understanding and utilize student artifacts that serve as data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In 2023, the data showed that 58% of students were below level proficiency, scoring less than a 3 on the SSA. The improvement strategy of checks for understanding and data analysis will provide more targeted instruction for all grade levels, resulting in improvement student academic performance in science.

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.

Adapt current PLC sessions to be a place for teachers and school leadership to review student work and set criteria for levels of student understanding.

Person Responsible: Ann Perez (ann.perez@hcps.net)

By When: No later than the beginning of October 2023

Utilize the student work protocol to analyze the data and work with teachers on developing additional tasks, determining necessary scaffolds, and planning for teacher led small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Ann Perez (ann.perez@hcps.net)

By When: No later than the beginning of October 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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 the 2023 STAR 50% K, 54% 1st grade, and 51% in second grade scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. These scores were due to lack of professional learning communities, differentiation, and effective planning.

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

Based on the 2023 PMA #3 Scores, 64% in 3rd grade, 52% in 4th grade and 53% scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. These scores were due to lack of professional learning communities, differentiation, and effective 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

60% of students in grades K-2 will score at or above on the STAR PMA #3 assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

60% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher proficiency as measured by the FAST PMA #3 assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Student achievement and learning will be monitored using weekly walkthrough trends based on the school's Instructional Priorities as well as the district created Formatives and PMA's. Student progress will be analyzed by the school's electronic data wall and instruction will be strategically delivered based on needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Perez, Ann, ann.perez@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?

Develop checks for understanding using the B.E.S.T. ELA standards and utilize student artifacts that serve as data.

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?

In 2023, FAST PMA #3 data showed that K, 4th and 5th grade levels were below proficiency for students scoring a 3 or higher. The improvement strategy of checks for understanding and data analysis will provide more targeted instruction, resulting in improvement student academic performance in ELA.

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 |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Adapt current PLC sessions to be a place for teachers and school leadership to review student work and set criteria for levels of student understanding. | Perez, Ann, ann.perez@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.

In addition to the SIP being posted on the school website <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/lakemagdalene>,

The School Advisory Council paper invites are sent out the last two months of the previous year in both English and Spanish. Also, during Open House and throughout the year the meetings are advertised through flyers, Class dojo, which can be translated into family's native language, the school website, and Parent link. During the monthly meetings members contribute their thoughts and opinions to create the plan as well as make modifications.

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))

Communication to parents and the community are sent via school wide DOJO and the schools webpage. Communication about school and student progress are maintained throughout the year during academic events and scheduled conference night twice a year. Parents are made alert of their child's progress through class dojo, canvas, and paper progress alerts. Diverse school events are advertised through bilingual flyers, Class dojo messages that can be translated in the family's native language, the school website, and Parent link

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)

Grade level planning with the district science coach. Frequent data chats that drive instruction, collaborative planning across curriculum, use of school wide science tools and science library.

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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

Budget Approval

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

No