
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lewis Elementary School

6700 WHITEWAY DR, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

[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.

Learn Here, Succeed Anywhere!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roland H. Lewis Elementary School will provide every student with a safe Learning Environment Where Individuals are Successful.

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
Babanats, Melissa	Principal	Oversees school wide progress
Hinton, Carmon	Assistant Principal	Oversees school wide progress
Kelly, Kingsley	SAC Member	Conducts SAC meetings
Schisler, Kimberly	SAC Member	Conducts SAC meetings

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.

SAC Committee input into budget expenditures and schoolwide goals are captured in the spring. Title, I impact survey data also allows us to develop parent and community needs that best serve our population. SAC committee and faculty have provided valuable input on how we utilize our funds to enhance academic areas and improve technology. We also use valuable insight survey data from the staff and stakeholders who participate to make surgical improvements on our goals and objectives for this upcoming school year.

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 I.L.T. team will use current data in planning to focus on gaps in instruction that need Tier 2 and Tier 3 immediate attention. Schoolwide Tier 1 targets will drive 2 of the 4 PSLT (Problem Solving Leadership Team) meetings that look at schoolwide academic implementation and trends that impact each grade level.

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	80%
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	34	30	22	25	27	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	4	4	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	35	27	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	35	30	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	53	34	24	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	34	34	0	0	0	109
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	53	34	24	0	0	0	111
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	4	19	12	0	0	0	36

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	7
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	29	24	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	34	29	0	0	0	79
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	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	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	29	24	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	34	29	0	0	0	79
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	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	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	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	40	50	53	40	53	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				55			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			30		
Math Achievement*	38	56	59	42	50	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				57			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			10		
Science Achievement*	30	50	54	32	59	59	35		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	59	59	54			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	197
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	4	1
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL	32	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	35	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	3	
HSP	51			
MUL	33	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	40			38			30					53
SWD	29			29			17				4	
ELL	29			31			10				5	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			33			21				4	
HSP	38			29			18				5	70
MUL	45			18							2	
PAC												
WHT	50			57			67				5	27
FRL	35			35			25				5	50

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	55	47	42	57	53	32					54
SWD	20	45	44	24	44	38	22					
ELL	38	48	40	41	62		21					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	47	43	35	48	45	20					
HSP	46	55	36	42	59	64	38					67
MUL	33			33								
PAC												
WHT	58	68		59	73		46					
FRL	34	51	46	37	51	50	28					56

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	44	30	39	32	10	35					52
SWD	19	28	29	22	20	6	31					
ELL	39	18		47	20		27					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	41	38	27	22	12	20					
HSP	39	34	31	39	32		30					55
MUL	29			37								
PAC												
WHT	70	59		60	52		63					38
FRL	39	37	29	34	26	11	31					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	44%	53%	-9%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	29%	46%	-17%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	37%	55%	-18%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	61%	-22%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	53%	-17%	55%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	30%	47%	-17%	51%	-21%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

-Science Achievement was our lowest area of performance at a 30%. In the previous year it was a 32%. Although not a significant decrease it is an area of concern. Some of the factors to consider were extreme student behaviors within some of the classrooms. We also attempted to do a 4th/5th grade split with our classes that did not lend to positive results due to the extensive planning that was required by each teacher.

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

-The greatest decline was in Math. We went from a 42% achievement to a 38% achievement. Some of the factors to consider were extreme student behaviors within some of the classrooms. We also attempted to do a 4th/5th grade split with our classes that did not lend to positive results due to the extensive planning that was required by each teacher.

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 Achievement was our lowest area of performance at a 30%. In the previous year it was a 32%. Although not a significant decrease it is an area of concern. Some of the factors to consider were extreme student behaviors within some of the classrooms. We also attempted to do a 4th/5th grade split with our classes that did not lend to positive results due to the extensive planning that was required by each teacher.

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

-Although there was not any improvement in achievement, the area of ELA remained at 40%. This year we are utilizing an academic interventionists which will focus on small group instruction to increase achievement.

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

-Science Achievement and Math Achievement overall.

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

- Increase Math Achievement
- Increase Science Achievement
- Increase ELA Achievement
- increase learning gains in all areas
- increase bottom quartile learning gains in all areas

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 Student Engagement

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.

Area of focus-involve all stakeholders in an effort to increase student engagement by planning quality, core instruction. Rationale-to increase overall proficiency and overall learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All subgroups will reach or maintain 41% or above proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership team will attend planning sessions and PLC's. Frequent, specific and timely feedback will be provided through walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@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.)

Increase the culture of learning through purposeful, professional development for strategic planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Purposeful professional development will lend itself to increase learning gains and proficiency in all sub groups.

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.

1. Conduct grade level standard best planning sessions.
2. Regularly scheduled PLC meetings
3. Purposeful differentiated instruction.
4. Culturally Responsive training and management courses.
5. Coaching cycles and feedback sessions.
6. Frequent walkthrough feedback with an emphasis on instructional priorities.
7. Inclusion model will increase the success of SWD and black subgroup will be closely monitored on data tracker.

Person Responsible: Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@hcps.net)

By When: On-going

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of students with chronic attendance, as measured by EdConnect, will decrease from 15% in 2022/2023 to 10% in 2023-2024

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance, led by the attendance team, will be monitored daily and quarterly by analyzing data from EdConnect, and other data sources, in the school's electronic attendance data wall. The data will be monitored and tracked to look for trends and patterns and used to intervene before chronic attendance can occur. The Data Processor will submit the daily attendance to the school's social worker. The attendance will be reviewed so attendance plans, for students who are chronically absent, can be adjusted, if necessary. The attendance team will meet monthly to review all data to adjust the SIP's Action Steps. The School Advisory Council

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@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.)

Rtl will be focused on strengthening all Tiers to improve student attendance, particularly with students that have chronic absenteeism.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using Rtl for attendance is to utilize a schoolwide process that supports students at all three tiers.

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.

Start of the School Year Action Steps:

- During pre-planning; outreach to parents of formerly chronically absent students is made to proactively identify family needs that can be met prior to school beginning.
- During preplanning, an attendance electronic database is created by the Social Worker to track daily

attendance.

- Principal forms an Attendance Team to monitor Tiers 1, 2, and 3. The team meets every other month

Action Steps:

- Monitor Data

- Establish and maintain a consistent and reliable attendance reporting system.

- Engage Students and Families

- Daily Parentlinks for students with an absence

- Recognize Good and Improved Attendance

- Attendance challenges are held monthly

- Letters sent to inform Parents about the amount of absences / importance of attending school.

- All parent-teacher conferences include a discussion about the student's attendance.

- Eliminate barriers and consider referral to SSW

Person Responsible: Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@hcps.net)

By When: on going

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Area of Focus- There is a need to improve proficiency and gains in math in the bottom quartile according to the FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math proficiency, math gains, and math bottom quartile will increase by 5 points on the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by PLC, data chats, planning sessions and walkthrough with frequent feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@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.)

Increase the culture of learning through purposeful professional development and strategic planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Purposeful professional development and feedback will lend itself to increase learning gains and proficiency.

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.

1. Conduct grade level standard based planning sessions.
2. Regularly scheduled PLC's meetings.
3. Purposeful differentiated instruction.
4. Culturally responsive training and management courses.
5. Coaching cycles and feedback sessions
6. Frequent walkthrough feedback with an emphasis on instructional priorities.

Person Responsible: Melissa Babanats (melissa.babanats@hcps.net)

By When: on-going

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).

As far as our Title 1 funds: The allocation of an Academic Interventionist and a Math resource lead will directly impact proficiency levels in ELA, Math, and indirectly in Science. Student and teacher supply money directly related to resources needed to launch the implementation of the P.B.I.S. system and the UFLI reading phonics program has direct impact of student success in grades K-5 moving forward this year. Family engagement funds to produce packets and work for supporting UFLI will directly impact the fidelity of this new foundational skills

attack on literacy. The purchase of Newline Interactive teacher screens will enhance learning and allow students and teachers to interact with critical components of the Tier 1 core instruction supports in each subject area. We also purchased the Magnetic Reading materials to assist with instruction.

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 final iReady Diagnostic in Spring 2023, % of K-2 students scored "Mid-Year, Late Year and Above" in Reading, Teachers spent a great deal of time learning the new standards and curriculum resources, which observation data show had a positive impact on whole group, or shared, instruction. Deeper planning for small group rotations and individual student needs is needed. Teachers will plan each weekly unit as a team, then reflect and plan on a weekly basis toward mastery of daily objectives and targeted small group rotations with consideration of our teacher and student priority look fors. Administration and content coaches will participate in weekly planning.

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

According to 2023 FAST in Reading, 40% of 3rd-5th graders scored a level 3 or higher. With new standards and curriculum resources in 3-5, we will increase teacher clarity around new BEST standards for ELA in 3-5 through weekly collaborative planning sessions. These sessions will begin with planning

and then working through each week by reviewing student data and needs to inform instruction. Administration and content coaching will participate in weekly 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

Based on iReady Final Diagnostic AND FAST Data, 50% of K-2 students will score ON LEVEL

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on iReady Final Diagnostic AND FAST Data, 50% of 3-5 students will score ON LEVEL

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.

Through the Leadership Team (administration and content coaches) and Instructional Leadership Team (teacher leaders), walkthrough trends and student data will be systematically analyzed on a weekly basis, with adjustments to instruction and groupings made as needed. Data analysis is scheduled out based on the following assessment calendar: iReady Diagnostic 1, checkpoints, unit assessments, FAST assessments

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Babanats, Melissa, melissa.babanats@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?

Collaborative standards aligned planning with a focus on teacher and student clarity is recognized in John Hattie’s work, Visible Learning, as a research based best practice.

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?

Feedback and student data from similar schools in the district demonstrate this practice is effective. Additionally, prior data in student learning gains indicate success.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-Literacy coaching/use of academic interventionist	Babanats, Melissa, melissa.babanats@hcps.net
-collaborative planning	Babanats, Melissa, melissa.babanats@hcps.net
-walkthrough with feedback cycles	Babanats, Melissa, melissa.babanats@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.

-Families are notified of the SIP plan via ParentLink, provided information during conference nights and during our family curriculum nights. The schools website also is a means of allowing families to see the SIP Plan. <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/lewis>

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))

-The school holds numerous activities such as family curriculum nights, conference nights, family fun events, as well as grade level activities. Parents are also provided with quarterly progress alerts and report cards as well as frequent notifications for each individual teacher to their students.

<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/lewis>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

-Through our Title I program, we are able to offer additional academic assistance through our ELP program. We also have purchased supplemental instructional and intervention materials to assist our students.

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))

-

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))

-

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))

-

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).

-

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))

-

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))

-