

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Heritage Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Heritage Elementary School

18201 E MEADOWS RD, Tampa, FL 33647

[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.

Heritage Elementary School will guide students to meet individual goals through self accountability, a growth mindset and demonstration of leadership skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Heritage Elementary School will prepare our students for life through high expectations for academic and personal growth.

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
Booth, Mary	Principal	School Principal, Instructional Leader

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.

As a school, we hold a SAC meeting with parents, teachers, and community members at the beginning of the year. At the meeting, our SAC chair presents to members of the SAC committee a draft of the SIP. The members of SAC are able to provide input on our Areas of Focus and our action steps. We then hold a vote to approve the SIP with our SAC committee and another vote with our instructional school employees.

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))

At monthly SAC meetings, current school data with be presented and we will revisit our SIP Area of focus action steps to ensure effective implementation.

We will also hold monthly data chats with our school employees to analyze current student data and we will revisit our SIP Area of focus action steps to ensure effective implementation.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	81%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 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	26	19	19	22	13	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	13	1	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	19	17	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	19	27	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	12	10	14	13	16	0	0	0	74

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	9	6	0	0	0	17

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	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	12	10	14	9	14	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	3	13	12	9	7	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	0	6	12	3	13	5	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	9	7	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	5	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	0	5	9	5	1	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	0	5	8	5	1	0	0	0	21
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	13	12	10	14	9	14	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	3	13	12	9	7	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	0	6	12	3	13	5	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	9	7	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	5	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	0	5	9	5	1	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	0	5	8	5	1	0	0	0	21
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*	59	50	53	66	53	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				73			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				68			47		
Math Achievement*	67	56	59	74	50	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				89			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				87			29		
Science Achievement*	71	50	54	65	59	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	43	59	59	51			57		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	573
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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	60			
HSP	47			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	52			

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	58			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	73			
HSP	66			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	64			

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	59			67			71					43
SWD	27			39			40				5	46
ELL	42			63			50				5	43
AMI												
ASN	77			91			91				3	
BLK	57			62			71				4	
HSP	53			49			57				5	30
MUL	61			77			60				3	
PAC												
WHT	59			73			78				5	50
FRL	46			57			58				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	66	73	68	74	89	87	65					51
SWD	36	72	68	45	78	82	39					40
ELL	51	79	60	68	76		56					51
AMI												
ASN	79	94		90	94		73					

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	60	70	77	71	91	94	50					
HSP	62	72	55	63	77		71					64
MUL	68	62		84	92							
PAC												
WHT	70	68		78	93		70					35
FRL	50	70	67	64	83	83	40					53

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	66	54	47	63	58	29	53					57
SWD	35	50	46	31	33	27	11					42
ELL	53	50		58	60		45					57
AMI												
ASN	80			84								
BLK	66	55		56	55		50					
HSP	56	45		52	30		40					78
MUL	62			57								
PAC												
WHT	69	55		71	73		57					40
FRL	56	51	46	53	43	17	38					57

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	53%	13%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	46%	11%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	66%	55%	11%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	53%	8%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	47%	23%	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.

According to the 2022-2023 FAST data, of our students scoring in the Level 1 on FAST PM1 Reading and Math, 35% of these students remained at a Level 1 on PM3
 According to the 2022-2023 STAR data, of our students scoring in the 29th percentile or below range on PM1 Reding and Math, 70% of these students remained in the 29th percentile or below range on PM3.
 The contributing factors are lack of differentiation in core instruction and incidences in Tier Intervention.

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

In 2022-2023, the lowest performing area was our FAST Reading proficiency. For the 2021-2022 school year, 66% of our students were proficient in reading on FSA Assessment. In the 2022-2023 school year, 59% of our students were proficient in reading on the FAST Assessment.
 The contributing factors are a change in State Assessment and test format and lack differentiation in core instruction.

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

The greatest gap between our data and state average is SSA Science. The state average is 51% proficient and Heritage average is 70% proficient.
This is due to ELP science support, data analysis and common planning.

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

According to 2022-2023 5th grade SSA Science Assessment, 70% of our students were proficient. That is a increase from the 2021-2022 5th grade SSA Science Assessment on 1%.
This is due to ELP science support, data analysis and common planning.

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

According to our EWS data, our two areas of concern are 10% or more of absences and Level 1 on ELA and Math State Wide Assessments.

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

1. Improve our number of absences through incentives and public tracking
2. Differentiation in core instruction
3. Purposeful Tier 2 and 3 Intervention.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Student achievement will increase through a systematic approach of targeted instruction through weekly collaborative planning and structured professional learning communities. Schoolwide structures will focus on rigorous core instruction, differentiation, ongoing data analysis, and communication with stakeholders. While we were above the state and district proficiency for both Reading and Math FAST, the data suggests this is still an area we can continue to improve. It will be essential for teachers to work together to plan and implement strategies that will meet the needs of each individual learner.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, 59% of students were proficient in Reading, based on the FAST Assessment. Our goal is for 70% of students to be proficient on the Reading FAST PM3 Assessment for the 2023-2024 school year.

In the 2022-2023 school year, 69% of students were proficient in Math, based on the FAST Assessment. Our goal is for 76% of students to be proficient on the Math FAST PM3 Assessment for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will receive monthly feedback focused on how core instruction and differentiation impacted student learning outcomes. Weekly planning with the TTD and administration will occur. Plans will include differentiation and engagement strategies as well as common assessments for progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Weekly common planning with TTD
2. On-going coaching cycles and feedback by administration and coaches
3. On-going progress monitoring and data analysis sessions
4. On-going professional development in new state standards

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

While we were above the state and district proficiency for both Reading and Math FAST, the data suggests this is still an area we can continue to improve. We will use iReady and support materials, Wonders support materials, DIBELS, and UFLI (K-2). Common assessments will be used to assess student needs and identify unfinished learning, small groups will be formed based on this current data. Lessons will be differentiated to reinforce and enrich learning, prepare students for upcoming learning, and remediate as needed.

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.

TTDs will facilitate weekly standards based planning sessions

-support development of instructional plans

-evaluate student work and data

-deepen teachers' understanding of resources and best practices

-deepen teachers' understanding on concepts and content

Person Responsible: Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

By When: FAST PM3

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on the Panorama Survey which is taken every year by our 3rd-5th grade students, only 47% of students responded favorably to the question about School Climate. Therefore, our school has adopted the 7 Mindsets core SEL curriculum to build upon the positive school culture that already exists. Students are learning how their mindsets impact their learning and their feelings. The core mindsets are Everything is Possible, Passion First, Attitude of Gratitude, We are Connected, 100% Accountable, Live to Give, and The Time is Now. These mindsets are explicitly taught in school and shared with our families and community stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the Panorama Survey which is taken every year by our 3rd-5th grade students, only 47% of students responded favorably to the question about School Climate. Our goal is to have 60% of students respond favorably to School Climate.

Monitoring:

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

Mary Booth, Principal and Brandi Anderson, Assistant Principal- Promoting, leading and supporting students, teachers, and families in the implementation of the 7 mindsets.
Andrea Simpson, School Counselor- Conducting class lessons and small group lessons to build a deeper understanding of the mindsets. Promoting, leading and supporting students, teachers, and families in the implementation of the 7 mindsets.
All Teachers- Implement weekly mindset lessons and promote a positive school and classroom climate and culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Booth (mary.booth@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 is the 7 Mindsets Curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

7 Mindsets Curriculum was selected because Mindsets, defined by the University of Chicago as beliefs and attitudes about oneself, the external world, and the interaction between the two, are the default lenses that individuals use to process everyday experiences. Students who experience a firm belief in their potential, an optimistic vision for the future, and a strong sense of personal authenticity perform better academically and forge more substantial relationships in life. Students who received 7 Mindsets instruction for at least five months showed significant improvements in behavior, attendance, achievement, and prosocial qualities such as resilience and grit.

These outcomes include:

- 42% decrease in out-of-school suspensions (FL high school)
- 67% decrease in teacher referrals (TX middle school)

· 22% increase in attendance (MN middle school)

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.

Mary Booth, Principal and Brandi Anderson, Assistant Principal- Promoting, leading and supporting students, teachers, and families in the implementation of the 7 mindsets.

Andrea Simpson, School Counselor- Conducting class lessons and small group lessons to build a deeper understanding of the mindsets. Promoting, leading and supporting students, teachers, and families in the implementation of the 7 mindsets.

All Teachers- Implement weekly mindset lessons and promote a positive school and classroom climate and culture.

Person Responsible: Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

By When: By the time the end of the year Panorama Survey is given.

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))

-

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))

-

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))

-