
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Kingswood Elementary School

3102 S KINGS AVE, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Carmen Sheffield

Start Date for this Principal: 9/14/2015

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Kingswood Elementary School

3102 S KINGS AVE, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide all students with the skills necessary to be successful and productive members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become the nation's leader in developing successful students by providing a personalized and equitable education for all students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Amos, Lisa	Principal	Principal Schedule Hold meetings with faculty, parents, and community members regarding SIP/SAC
Odell, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	ELA teacher 5th grade Attend meetings and give input for SIP/SAC
Morales, Rosie	SAC Member	Run SAC meetings monthly. Invite SAC members to meeting and create agendas.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/14/2015, Carmen Sheffield

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	42	65	61	73	63	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	380
Attendance below 90 percent	10	24	11	15	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	65	69	74	69	74	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	8	3	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	4	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	65	69	74	69	74	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	8	3	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	4	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	52%	57%	51%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	55%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	50%	53%	54%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	54%	63%	48%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	57%	62%	39%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	51%	23%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	50%	53%	36%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	57%	21%	64%	14%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	60%	-16%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	6	40	56	29	40	42	8				
ELL	33	38	30	37	34		29				
BLK	39	64		66	64		17				
HSP	41	46	44	53	53	36	38				
WHT	52	60	45	67	67		50				
FRL	36	46	52	51	55	44	31				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	25	15	33	43	30					
ELL	45	36		70	78						
BLK	46	45		63	64		42				
HSP	54	45	17	67	73	60	57				
MUL	42			50							
WHT	47	52	50	65	62	46	48				
FRL	47	47	39	61	65	48	48				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	29	36	13	7						
ELL	53	62	73	56	56	50	40				
BLK	44	62	62	35	38	40	35				
HSP	59	66	60	54	43	14	34				
MUL	40	45		40	27						
WHT	51	44	33	51	38	18	39				
FRL	49	59	61	43	39	27	33				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
---------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

In our school data our science achievement was our lowest at 37% of 5th graders showing proficiency with our math lowest 25%ile's achievement being at 41% followed by our ELA achievement at 44% profieient. The science test requires the students to read quite a bit as they take the test and that students' limited vocabulary does imprede their ability to even understand what the questions are asking them. There was a strong focus on scientific vocabulary learning during the year. The inclusion of other vocabulary which would help students understand what the question is asking will help the students clarify the task they are being asked to complete.

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

Science achievement went down from 51% to 37% which is a decline of 14 percent.

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.

Once again, our science achievement was 37% proficient while the state was at 53% which is a 16 percent gap between Kingswood and the state.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile increased by 17% from 36% to 53 percent. Our goal for last year was to focus heavily on pulling small groups particularly of bottom quartile students in all areas.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Academic achievement in all academic areas(science, math, and ELA) with a particular focus on students with disabilities and ELL students.

Student attendance needs improvement particularly the percentage of students who have missed more than 10% of school.

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

1. Increase science achievement
2. Increase student attendance
3. Increase achievement for Students with disabilities subgroup (data was at 32%)
4. Increase achievement for English Language Learners subgroup(data was at 37%)
5. Increase achievement for Math lowest quartile students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

better understanding of more vocabulary will help all students improve achievement in math, reading and science. This vocabulary would not only be infused throughout the day and throughout the school but also direct instruction in the area of vocabulary will happen in each classroom. Students will begin to utilize more sophisticated vocabulary in their writing and every day conversations thus making it easier to comprehend when they read with this wider vocabulary they will develop.

Measurable Outcome:

The percent of students who show proficiency in ELA on the FSA will go up from 44% to 55%. The percent of students who show proficiency in Math will go up from 59% to 65% and the percent of students in science on the FSA will go up from 37 % to 55%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Amos (lisa.amos@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Use of 5 day vocabulary, flowcabulary, and word nerds, as methods to teach direct vocabulary lessons

Rationale

Word walls displayed and referenced by students and adults in all classrooms

Evidence-based Strategy:

According to John Hattie's educational research, direct instruction has a .82 effect size on student achievement. Additionally, the use of word walls is a high impact instructional strategy. Students will gain independence by using a word wall in daily activities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development in area of vocabulary instruction provided by content area coaches to include word nerd techniques, 5 day vocabulary plan and flowcabulary.
2. Hold mini share sessions during faculty meetings regarding strategies teachers use in the classroom to manage their vocabulary instruction (how do they decide on the words, what do their student notebooks look like, etc.)
3. Conduct administrative walk throughs to specifically look for our vocabulary look fors (word walls, students/teachers referencing word walls, student vocabulary notebooks, students are able to articulate the vocabulary they are learning and why it is important). Utilize these walk throughs to provide individual feedback to teachers as well as to identify teachers who could share a strategy they are using with the faculty as stated in action step number 2.
4. Continue weekly PLCs in each grade level so that teachers may collaborate on lesson planning and on data analysis.

Person Responsible

Lisa Amos (lisa.amos@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: By Identifying English Language learners at our school during our PSLT meetings we will address each student regarding any extra services or instruction that can be provided for them in the areas that data indicates they need the assistance.

Measurable Outcome: English Language Learners federal index will increase from 37 to 42% as indicated by the results on the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Amos (lisa.amos@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be invited to the extended learning Program(ELP) or be provided an extra lesson or feedback session weekly with our reading coach, math coach, or the ELL resource teacher. This weekly lesson or feedback session will be based on the students' current data and needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie's research there is a high effect size of .70 for feedback and .60 for direct instruction. Although these students may already have extra services provided by our ESE department or ELL department, the current data indicates this is not enough for them.

Action Steps to Implement

- . Hold PSLT meeting specifically to address our SWD and ELL students regarding any extra instruction they may need.
- 2.Develop a schedule for these particular students to receive more time for direct instruction in a small group with the reading coach, math resource teacher or ELL resource teacher.
- 3. Students attend either ELP or lesson with personnel in #2 to receive lessons/feedback on their areas of need.
- 4. Create a data wall specifically for these students in our PSLT room to track their progress and discuss the progress monthly at our meetings.
- 5. Modify lessons according to current data for each student.

Person Responsible Lisa Amos (lisa.amos@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: By Identifying the students with disabilities at our school during our PSLT meetings we will address each student regarding any extra services or instruction that can be provided for them in the areas that data indicates they need the assistance.

Measurable Outcome: Students with disabilities federal index will increase from 32 to 42% as indicated by the results on the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Amos (lisa.amos@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be invited to the extended learning Program(ELP) based on the students' current data and needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie's research there is a high effect size of .70 for feedback and .60 for direct instruction. Although these students may already have extra services provided by our ESE department, the current data indicates this is not enough for them.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hold PSLT meeting specifically to address our SWD and ELL students regarding any extra instruction they may need.
2. Develop a schedule for these particular students to receive more time for direct instruction in a small group with the reading coach, math resource teacher or ELL resource teacher.
3. Students attend either ELP or lesson with personnel in #2 to receive lessons/feedback on their areas of need.
4. Create a data wall specifically for these students in our PSLT room to track their progress and discuss the progress monthly at our meetings.
5. Modify lessons according to current data for each student.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Other specifically relating to student attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: When students are late to class, signed out early, or simply absent from school it sets them behind academically. Students need to be in class in order to learn and keep up with their classmates. We see a direct correlation between students' success in school and how many absences they have each year.

Measurable Outcome: Currently only 82% of our students are in attendance 90% of the time. We would like to increase this to 90% of our students being in attendance 90% of the time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Amos (lisa.amos@hcps.net)

Assigning a school- based volunteer to be a mentor for the students who are in threat of being on this list.

Evidence-based Strategy: Invite parent in to meet with admin, teacher, or social worker to discuss any home interventions that need to take place to help the child be at school. Hold a contest for these students regarding attendance and keep a data chart in pod 1 regarding their progress so that principal can check in with each student when they come for their grade level team time.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to a study by Walberg, He noted that reinforcement has a 1.17 effect size on learning outcomes and home interventions has a .50 effect size. Both reinforcement for the child and home interventions can be facilitated by the mentor.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Have social worker identify the list of students who have had a previous attendance issue or who are currently heading in that direction.
2. Hold meeting with any staff member who would like to volunteer to mentor. Provide a training regarding expectations of the mentor and the contest guidelines for the students.
3. Mentors will reach out to the student and hold an initial conference with the student to see what is keeping them from being at school. Mentor will develop a plan with the child to help them be successful by using the interview and an interest survey to see what might motivate their child to get to school.
4. Mentors provide weekly data to principal regarding attendance and principal holds brief check in session at team time in pod 1 with child when entering data on contest chart.
5. Mentor will make contact with family to set up a conference to see how the school can assist at home if needed.

Person Responsible Lisa Amos (lisa.amos@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

NA

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home flyers, making parent link phone calls and posting everything on our website and social media. We focus on communicating every child's progress to families by engaging parents in parent/teacher conferences and sending home quarterly progress note. School staff, students, parents, and the community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. We persist at building positive relationships with families.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.