

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Belmont Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Belmont Elementary School

14150 GATE DANCER RD, Sun City Center, FL 33573

[ 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.

Belmont Elementary will provide a high quality education in a safe, respectful and inclusive environment that builds a foundation for life-long learning.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Belmont Elementary students will have success for today and be prepared for tomorrow.

### 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
Cook, Destony	Assistant Principal	
Dodd, Candice	Principal	
Canavan, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Henderson, Felicia	Reading Coach	
Jolly, April	Math Coach	
Mikell, Tiffaney	Other	RTI Resource

#### 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 school leadership team collaboratively analyzed the prior school year's data, planned the areas of focus for the current school year, and planned action steps to monitor the areas of focus. During pre-planning, the teachers reflected on the prior school year and provided input for the SIP. The SAC was involved by collaboratively sharing input on the SIP from a parent/community perspective as well as from a staff/teacher perspective.

#### 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 SIP will be monitored midyear to assess progress toward our measurable goals. The leadership team will analyze walkthrough data and student data (including ESSA subgroups) to determine whether

we are on track with our student achievement goals. Action steps will be revised, if necessary, to address any needs determined at the midyear reflection.

### Demographic Data

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	75%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	86%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)*
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### 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	45	34	46	38	32	0	0	0	195	
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	4	5	3	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	62	38	1	0	0	0	101	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	61	55	0	0	0	0	116	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	65	33	48	0	0	0	146	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	66	47	62	0	0	0	175	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	62	38	1	0	0	0	101	

**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	1	3	1	29	23	1	0	0	0	58

**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	1	5	2	9	1	1	0	0	0	19
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	2	51	51	33	28	43	0	0	0	208	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	4	3	6	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	35	37	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	41	54	0	0	0	112	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	61	56	57	0	0	0	174	

**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	1	0	8	10	3	0	0	0	22



**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	2	18	1	0	0	0	0	27
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	2	51	51	33	28	43	0	0	0	208	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	4	3	6	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	35	37	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	41	54	0	0	0	112	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	61	56	57	0	0	0	174	

**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	1	0	8	10	3	0	0	0	22

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	3	20	1	0	0	0	0	32
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	42	53	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				52			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			41		
Math Achievement*	36	56	59	42	50	50	44		
Math Learning Gains				46			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32			18		
Science Achievement*	34	50	54	30	59	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	59	59	69			55		

\* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	208
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	20	Yes	2	2
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	31	Yes	2	1
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	34	Yes	2	

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	43			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	39			36			34					61
SWD	12			18			15				5	42
ELL	32			28			13				5	61
AMI												
ASN	75			67							2	
BLK	33			26			27				4	
HSP	34			32			22				5	64
MUL	57			51			53				4	
PAC												
WHT	42			45			50				4	
FRL	33			30			25				5	53

**2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2020-21</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2020-21</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	42	52	39	42	46	32	30					69
SWD	23	40	33	21	36	25	9					55
ELL	36	50	53	40	46	25	15					69
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	34	44	27	32	42	42	19					
HSP	38	49	44	40	45	31	29					66
MUL	56	67		48	41		43					
PAC												
WHT	49	60		52	52		43					
FRL	33	45	35	34	42	27	24					67

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	45	51	41	44	41	18	45					55
SWD	27	25		25	27		31					
ELL	37	58		37	46		18					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	41		34	17		37					
HSP	41	46		42	48		35					55
MUL	61			48								
PAC												
WHT	59	67		57	67		68					
FRL	37	46	36	36	35	14	41					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	41%	53%	-12%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	36%	46%	-10%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	55%	-17%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	61%	-22%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	47%	-15%	51%	-19%

### 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 lowest performance areas were science (35% proficiency) and math (38% proficiency for grades 3-5).

Contributing factors include instability of instructional staff and a lack of prerequisite skills. Additionally, although weekly collaborative planning was in place, the planning was geared towards whole group instruction; planning lacked intentionally plans for small group instruction.

**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 2022 to 2023 (42% to 38%). Factors that contributed to the decline include instability of staff and lack of consistency for planning small group instruction during weekly collaborative planning. There were no math coaches and RTI teacher to support teachers with planning and interventions. In addition, STEMscopes was a new curriculum that all math teachers utilized, so there was a learning curve with new resources.

**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.**

Third grade and fifth grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Inconsistency with staff and a lack of consistency for planning small group instruction during weekly

collaborative planning contributed to the low performance. There were no math coaches and RTI resource to facilitate planning and support students and grade level teams with academic performance.

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

Science showed the most improvement from 2022 to 2023 (30% to 35%). The DRT facilitated weekly planning with the fifth grade team, science data was analyzed on a weekly basis, and there was more consistency with the same science teachers staffed throughout the entire school year.

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

Math proficiency, learning and BQ gains are an area of concern.

Second concern: Attendance; almost 1/3 of students in every grade level had 10% or more days absent.

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

Math proficiency, ELA and Math gains, and ELA and Math gains for BQ students.

**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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment****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.

Classroom Environment and School Culture was deemed a critical need based on the 2022-2023 TNTP data. PBIS and our House system will be key levers for improving our student culture data. There was a large turnover in staff at the end of the 2022-2023 school year. Belmont will incorporate weekly team building activities to encourage staff collaboration.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, TNTP data will be improve by 50%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The administrative team will review and compare TNTP to look for increase in all areas. The administrative team will create an anonymous survey mid-year to measure the effectiveness of collaborative planning, the House system, professional development, and overall school culture.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@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 principal will meet monthly with the staff and incorporate team building activities into these meetings. A school-wide House system will be implemented August 2023. Staff members will be nominated monthly to highlight positive contributions to the school. Tiger Den (new teacher) mentoring will take place monthly. Tiger Shout-Outs will be given to recognize teachers using best teaching practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A combination of the House System, PBIS and weekly team building will increase the staff's sense of belonging and build relationships with their colleagues. Students will feel a sense of belonging through the new systems in place, such as the House System and morning meetings to focus on character building, communication skills, and social skills.

**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.

Tiger of the Month for Faculty  
Intentional Team Builders  
Tiger Den Mentoring



Tiger Shout Outs  
House Celebrations  
Tier I Behavior Systems  
Actions Teams

**Person Responsible:** Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.net)

**By When:** The above strategies will continue throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

**#2. 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.

The data below indicates a need to continue the focus on Standards-Aligned instruction and task alignment through common planning. Teachers and instructional coaches will plan twice weekly for 50 minutes to design common opportunities for discussion and tasks and review the results of those common assessments.

In the 2022-2023 school year math proficiency decreased by 4% in grades 3-5 while reading proficiency remained at 42 %. There was a 5% increase in science proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

According to the FAST assessment 53 percent of our students in 3-5 will be proficient in both reading and math by the spring administration. According to the FSSA, 50% of our students will be at a level 3 or higher by the end of the year.

**Monitoring:**

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

In the area of mathematics 53 percent of our students will be considered proficient on unit/district quarterly assessments.

In the area of reading 53 percent of our students will be considered proficient on unit/district quarterly assessments and the weekly spotlights.

In science the common mini-assessments will be used to track proficiency by standard. Additionally 50% percent of the students will be proficient on the mid-year PMA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@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.)

Bi-weekly Common planning with a focus on tasks and opportunities for discussion aligned with B.E.S.T. Embedded internationalizations in all content areas to build teacher knowledge of the standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the FAST assessment 53 percent of our students in 3-5 will be proficient in both reading and math by the spring administration. the 50th percentile in both reading and math by the spring administration.

According to the FSSA, 50% of our students will be at a level 3 or higher by the end of the year.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

Bi-weekly common planning for 50 minutes with the instructional coaches  
 50 minute specials  
 Data Driven Instruction  
 Monthly Professional Development  
 Walkthrough Feedback  
 Focused Data Driven PLCs

**Person Responsible:** Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.net)

**By When:** The above action steps will continue throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

The math resource teachers will model and co-plan lessons for standards aligned tasks with all math teachers in K-5. The resource teachers will build teacher content knowledge of mathematics. They will support grade levels with understanding their data, developing activities for small group instructions and provide opportunities to co-teach lesson to build teacher capacity.

**Person Responsible:** April Jolly (april.jolly@hcps.net)

**By When:** The above action step will continue throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

RTI Resource teacher will support teachers and student services team in academic achievement for grades K-5. The resource teacher will analyze data with 3rd-5th grade teachers, develop a plan to support Tier 2 and 3 students in ELA and Math, and conduct small group instruction to support those groups of targeted students.

**Person Responsible:** Tiffaney Mikell (tiffaney.mikell@hcps.net)

**By When:** The above action step will continue throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Teachers will participate in after-school collaborative planning to plan for core and small group instruction. They will participate in reading, math, and science data dives to develop action plans to address student academic needs.

**Person Responsible:** Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.net)

**By When:** The above action step will continue throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

During the month of June and July, selected instructional staff and AP will analyze ELA, Math, Science and behavioral data. The team will develop plans, break down specific standards that were strengths and weaknesses, and develop resource maps that will support the work of meeting the needs of students.

**Person Responsible:** Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.net)

**By When:** The above action step will continue throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Professional development will be provided to increase teacher content knowledge and effective instructional practices. Mini training sessions will also be offered based upon classroom walkthrough trends.

**Person Responsible:** Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.net)

**By When:** The above action step will continue throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to****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.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Monitoring:**

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

**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.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**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).

-

**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**

During the 2022-2023 school year, 27% of kindergarten students scored below the 40th percentile on early literacy/Star Reading, 40% of first grade students scored below the 40th percentile on early literacy/Star Reading, and 47% of second grade students scored below the 40th percentile on early literacy/Star Reading. The 2023 EOY I-Ready Reading diagnostic shows a similar trend, with 93% of kindergarten students meeting proficiency, 67% of first grade students meeting proficiency, and 54% of second grade students meeting proficiency. Based on last year's data, this year's third graders will be a target area to focus on to make sure students are showing growth and meeting proficiency on the FAST assessment for the 2023-2024 school year.

For our Area of Focus, all kindergarten, first grade, and second grade teachers will plan with the reading coach for 50 minutes once per week. Planning will focus on teacher clarity of the benchmarks, planning student tasks aligned to the benchmarks, and UFLI/small group planning. UFLI will be utilized daily for phonics instruction, and DIBELS will be used for progress monitoring.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 64% of third graders scored below a level 3 on FAST, 52% of fourth graders scored below a level 3 on FAST, and 57% of fifth graders scored below a level 3 on FAST. According to the 2023 EOY I-Ready Reading diagnostic, 75% of third graders met proficiency, and 56% of fourth graders met proficiency.

For our Area of Focus, all third-fifth grade teachers will plan with the reading coach for 50 minutes twice per week. Planning will focus on teacher clarity of the benchmarks, planning student tasks aligned to the benchmarks, and small group planning. UFLI will be utilized for any students needing phonics intervention, and DIBELS will be used for progress monitoring. Beginning at the end of September, ELP groups will target bottom quartile students in grades 3-5, as well as students just below grade level (bubble students).

## 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 May 2024, 50% of third graders will score a Level 3 or higher on the FAST Reading assessment.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

2023 FAST data:

Overall for Grades 3-5 Reading, 42% of students scored a Level 3 or higher.

- Grade 3: 36% Level 3+
- Grade 4: 48% Level 3+
- Grade 5: 43% Level 3+

In May 2024, 50% of third graders, 50% of fourth graders, and 55% of fifth graders will score a Level 3 or higher on the FAST Reading 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.

The Area of Focus will be monitored using walkthrough data, planning notes, and teacher/student observation data. A data wall will be used to monitor student progress on I-Ready, FAST, and quarterly monitoring tools. Digital data walls for each grade level will also be used to track additional student data. PLCs will be held monthly to analyze data and plan based on identified learning gaps. The Instructional Leadership Team and Leadership Team will determine the impact of our Area of Focus throughout the year.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dodd, Candice, [candice.dodd@hcps.net](mailto:candice.dodd@hcps.net)

## Evidence-based Practices/Programs

**Description:**

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

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

UFLI will be implemented daily in grades K-2 for phonics instruction. DIBELS will be used for progress monitoring in grade K-5. Our reading coach will plan with grade-level teams, as well as model lessons and co-teach as necessary.

**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?

UFLI is an explicit and systematic program that teaches students the foundational skills necessary for proficient reading. Through the use of this program on a daily basis, students in grades K-2 will increase their reading fluency and will be better prepared for the transition into third grade when they will be "reading to learn", rather than "learning to read". Common planning with grade-level teams facilitated by the reading coach will help teachers reach a deeper understanding of the benchmarks and the tasks students should be able to do to show mastery of the benchmarks.

**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
<p>Literacy Leadership:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members of the Instructional Leadership Team will conduct weekly/bi-weekly walk throughs using Look-For feedback form to provide ongoing feedback to classroom teachers.</li> <li>The Instructional Leadership Team will develop aggressive monitoring tools to foster responsive teaching techniques and practices.</li> </ol>	Dodd, Candice, candice.dodd@hcps.net
<p>Literacy Coaching:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instructional coach will provide on-going coaching support, to include coaching cycles, immediate feedback, modeling and co-teaching.</li> <li>Instructional coach will support grade level collaborative planning to facilitate the development of benchmark aligned lessons/activities and rigorous discussion questions to promote student discourse.</li> </ol>	Henderson, Felicia, felicia.henderson@hcps.net
<p>Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data-driven instruction will be facilitated by conducting monthly/bi-weekly PLCs to reflect on hot data from the following assessments: FAST, STAR, I-Ready Diagnostics, Unit Assessments and/or Spotlight Benchmark Checkpoints and other curriculum embedded progress monitoring tools such as the UFLI weekly assessment.</li> <li>DIBELS will be utilized as a universal screener to identify students who are “at risk” and require additional support outside of core instruction.</li> </ol>	Dodd, Candice, candice.dodd@hcps.net
<p>Professional Learning</p> <p>Launch site-based professional development opportunities that focus on building teacher’s toolboxes with effective instructional practices, as they relate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aggressive Monitoring</li> <li>Standards-Based Planning and Instruction</li> </ol>	Dodd, Candice, candice.dodd@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.

-



**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))

PTA, SAC, family events, math/science night(s), three parent conference nights throughout the year, school Facebook page, parent volunteer opportunities, etc.

**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)**

-

**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))**

-