

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Sheehy 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Sheehy Elementary School

6402 N 40TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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.

Sheehy will equip students with knowledge and skills needed to succeed in our ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District’s vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District’s graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Sheehy will empower students to be great.

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
Gadson Yarbrough, Delia	Principal	Monitor the fidelity of the plan and engage stakeholders and instructional leaders in the monitoring and implementation of the plan, making adjustments as needed.
Nicolosi, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	Serve as the SAC Chair to engage stakeholders in the implementation and monitoring of the plan. The SAC Chair will lead meetings and create agendas.
Geathers, Demetria	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction Math Lead Assessment Chair
SalimBakare, Nebi	Instructional Coach	Science Coach and Academic Interventionist
Moody, Michelle	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESOL Resource Teacher and PSLT/MTSS Chair
Sekulits, Julie	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach

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.

Our SIP was developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders. This plan is based on a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that takes into account information on the academic achievement of children in relation to the challenging State academic standards, particularly the needs of those children who are failing, or are at-risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards. We looked at and discussed our EOY data from 2022-2023 as well as our new data from PM A1.

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 plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. We will use ongoing data throughout the year as a means to monitor academic performance and progress. This data will be presented and discussed at our monthly SAC meetings with adjustments to the academic plan as needed.

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	97%
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) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: D
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	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

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	24	23	27	24	10	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	7	6	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	16	15	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	19	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	10	30	39	22	15	0	0	0	116

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	1	6	12	4	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	8	16	1	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	5	13	3	0	0	0	23

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	24	23	27	24	10	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	7	6	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	16	15	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	19	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	10	30	39	22	15	0	0	0	116

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	1	6	12	4	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	8	16	1	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	5	13	3	0	0	0	23

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*	20	50	53	27	53	56	19		
ELA Learning Gains				54			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			56		
Math Achievement*	20	56	59	28	50	50	21		
Math Learning Gains				53			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			50		
Science Achievement*	16	50	54	26	59	59	18		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	29	59	59	56			43		

* 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	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	115
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
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	7	Yes	4	1
ELL	19	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	1	1
HSP	24	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
FRL	24	Yes	1	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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
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	20			20			16					29
SWD	13			0							2	
ELL	7			21							3	29
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			19			12				4	
HSP	14			27							3	30
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	20			20			16				5	32

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	27	54	58	28	53	58	26					56
SWD	19	40	42	31	44		21					
ELL	20			40								56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	51	56	25	50	57	22					
HSP	28	71		40	65							50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	26	52	58	27	52	58	25					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	19	38	56	21	31	50	18					43
SWD	9	53	64	12	61	67						
ELL	15			23								43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	39	64	20	29	50	15					
HSP	28			22								39
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	18	37	53	21	30	47	18					43

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	16%	53%	-37%	54%	-38%
04	2023 - Spring	16%	54%	-38%	58%	-42%
03	2023 - Spring	27%	46%	-19%	50%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	29%	55%	-26%	59%	-30%
04	2023 - Spring	16%	59%	-43%	61%	-45%
05	2023 - Spring	24%	53%	-29%	55%	-31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	14%	47%	-33%	51%	-37%

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, the lowest data component was in the area of ELA with 22% of students being proficient in ELA from grades 3 - 5. Contributing factors include: this year was a transition year to new standards and state assessment that was conducted online.

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

In the area of ELA there was a 5 point decrease from the previous year. Students need additional opportunities to practice items that are to the rigor of the benchmark. Students need more time learning how to navigate the online tools.

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, Science scores fell 11 points compared to the previous year. Students in grade 5 were lacking proficiency with standards that were taught during grades 3 and 4. In addition, students struggle in the area of reading and this impacts performance in science. Students need additional practice opportunities that mirror the rigor of the standards being assessed. Students also need to increase reading and testing stamina.

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

ELA and Math showed a decrease of 5 points, with an 11 point decrease in Science. The 2022-2023 school year, is considered a baseline year due to the new assessment. Teachers met weekly for common planning to ensure tasks were aligned to the rigor of the standards and students were provided opportunities to be assessed on question types that reflect the rigor of the benchmark. Students were given opportunities to use the tools and learn how to navigate the test online.

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

Reading proficiency continues to be an area of focus. Early Warning Systems data reflects 34 third graders and 30 fourth graders as Level 1 in the area of Reading. In addition, attendance is an area of focus. Students with attendance below 90% after the first 20 days of school were as follows: Kindergarten (1), Grade 1 (16), Grade 2 (20), Grade 3 (25), Grade 4 (15), Grade 5 (27).

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. Attendance

Area of Focus

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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

Rationale for area of focus:

In Gottfried's 2019 student (Chronic absenteeism in the classroom context) explains that students who are chronically absent have lower achievement outcomes. Students in classrooms with a higher percentage of chronic absentees have lower test scores.

The number of students with attendance below 90% are as follows:

- Grade 1 - 16
- Grade 2 - 20
- Grade 3 - 25
- Grade 4 - 15
- Grade 5 - 27

Measurable Outcome:

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

Goals to reduce the number of students with attendance below the 90% goal will be as follows by May 2023.:

- Grade 1 - 6
- Grade 2 - 10
- Grade 3 - 15
- Grade 4 - 5
- Grade 5 - 17

Monitoring:

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

An attendance team will meet weekly (PSLT) to review the below 90% attendance list by grade level and disseminate a watch list to teachers following the meeting.

The Data Processor will submit the daily attendance report to the Social Worker daily to monitor and record progress.

Interventions and attendance plans will be designed as an intervention for students who are at risk of falling below the goal of 90%.

The attendance team will meet weekly to adjust action steps for this area of focus.

Attendance will be addressed during grade level MTSS meetings and PLCs to target students in need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Moody (michelle.moody@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 for attendance will be used to provide interventions for students in need of attendance improvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rtl is a schoolwide process that supports students at all tiers. The following two sources document the effectiveness of Rtl:

John Hattie's Effect Size on Response to Intervention 1.29

Kim and Streeter's

Strategies and interventions for Improving School Attendance Encyclopedia of Social Work

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.

Share the importance of good attendance with parents during August newsletter, parent links, and social media.

Person Responsible: Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

Review 90% list of students with PSLT to analyze students with a history of poor attendance from last school year.

Person Responsible: Colleen Nicolosi (colleen.nicolosi@hcps.net)

By When: August 17, 2023

Review 90% Report after 20 days of school to sort students in need of intervention. Schedule conferences with parents to communicate concerns, provide research on attendance, and provide support to families.

Person Responsible: Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

By When: Sept 14, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our area of focus is identified as Benchmark-aligned Instruction. This is an area of focus for core instruction across content areas. Our instructional priority will employ high leverage instructional practices and structures that allow all students to master grade level benchmarks. This will be achieved with a focus on Modeling and Direct Instruction during core instruction for ELA, Math, and Science. Planning will focus on the gradual release of responsibility model to ensure an explicit model is highlighted during instruction to ensure students are successful before being released to work independently. During collaborative planning, teachers will design and practice ways to check for understanding during instruction to ensure students are working and comprehending to the rigor of the benchmarks.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable Outcomes Include:

By December 2023, 70% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided opportunities for students to be engaged in benchmark-aligned tasks for their grade level.

By December 2023, 70% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided students with an explicit model during instruction.

By December 2023, 70% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided students with a check for understanding during instruction.

By May 2024, 90% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided opportunities for students to be engaged in benchmark-aligned tasks for their grade level.

By May 2024, 90% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided students with an explicit model during instruction.

By May 2024, 90% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided students with a check for understanding during instruction.

In May 2024, 32% of students in grades 3 -5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the FAST ELA Assessment.

In May 2024, 33% of students in grades 3 - 5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the FAST MATH Assessment.

In May 2024, 31% of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the Science FSA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Walkthroughs will be completed by the Leadership Team: Principal, AP, Reading Coach, ESOL Resource Teacher, and Science Coach weekly. Grade level trend data will be gathered and analyzed during monthly ILT meetings. Look-fors have been created and shared with teachers for Direct Instruction and Modeling and Checks for Understanding. Look-fors have been determined by phases with Phase 1 serving as our entry point and Phase 3 indicated our desired outcome.

Week of September 4th walkthroughs will begin. Data will be reviewed, and next steps will be initiated on September 19th ILT meeting.

Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly and trend data will be reviewed and analyzed on the following ILT Meeting Dates: October 17, November 14, December 19, January 23, February 20, March 26, April 16, May 14.

An electronic forms has been created to collect evidence during walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Demetria Geathers (demetria.geathers@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.)

According to Hattie the following evidence-based interventions relate to (Instructional Priority) Direct Instruction and Modeling of benchmark aligned instruction.

Teacher Clarity (.75)

Direct Instruction (.60)

Explicit Teaching Strategies (.57)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When teachers make the content and literacy skills visible to students by explicitly modeling through think aloud demonstrations, use of exemplars, anchor charts, etc. students have a clear understanding of what they are being taught and asked to do. In Math, teachers make the content explicit by using teacher and student explanations, representations, and/or examples. Students are given the opportunity to solve problems and build connections amongst strategies and previous knowledge using student explanations and representations. Teachers highlight new learning verbally through student work and or anchor charts.

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.

Instructional Priorities and Look Fors are identified and communicated to teachers.

Person Responsible: Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

Leadership Team Begins Walkthroughs to gather and collect data to analyze .

Person Responsible: Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

By When: Begin walkthrough process first week of September.

Review trend dated monthly with ILT and determine PD to deliver to staff.

Person Responsible: Demetria Geathers (demetria.geathers@hcps.net)

By When: September 19 ILT Meeting (monthly reviews)

Review goal of 70% of teachers reaching goal by December.

Determine next steps for PD.

Person Responsible: Demetria Geathers (demetria.geathers@hcps.net)

By When: ILT Meeting on December 14th

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Area of focus for small group instruction has been identified to fill gaps in instruction and lack of foundational skills which has contributed to students performing below grade level proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable Outcomes Include:

By December 2023, 70% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided opportunities for students to be engaged in small group instruction to meet their needs.

By May 2024, 90% of teachers, as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided opportunities for students to be engaged in small group instruction to meet their needs.

In May 2024, 32% of students in grades 3 -5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the FAST ELA Assessment.

In May 2024, 33% of students in grades 3 - 5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the FAST MATH Assessment.

In May 2024, 31% of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 or above (proficiency) on the Science FSA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Walkthroughs will be completed by the Leadership Team: Principal, AP, Reading Coach, ESOL Resource Teacher, and Science Coach weekly. Grade level trend data will be gathered and analyzed during monthly ILT meetings. Look-fors have been created and shared with teachers for small group instruction. Look-fors have been determined by phases with Phase 1 serving as our entry point and Phase 3 indicated our desired outcome.

Week of September 4th walkthroughs will begin. Data will be reviewed, and next steps will be initiated on September 19th ILT meeting.

Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly and trend data will be reviewed and analyzed on the following ILT Meeting Dates: October 17, November 14, December 19, January 23, February 20, March 26, April 16, May 14.

An electronic forms has been created to collect evidence during walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

According to Hattie's Research:

Small Group instruction has a (.47) effect size
Rtl has a (1.29) effect size

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students that are performing below proficiency need targeted small group instruction to reteach and provide a more targeted level of support for students to meet their goals.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Look-Fors for small group instruction identified and communicated to teachers.

Person Responsible: Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

Leadership Team begins walkthroughs to gather and collect data to analyze and determine PD needs.

Person Responsible: Demetria Geathers (demetria.geathers@hcps.net)

By When: First week of September.

Review of goal of 70% of teachers reaching small group goal of Phase 2/3 by December 2023. Determine next steps for PD.

Person Responsible: Demetria Geathers (demetria.geathers@hcps.net)

By When: ILT meeting December 14th

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

33% of our Students with Disabilities were proficient on the 2022 FAST Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

40% of our Students with Disabilities will achieve proficiency on the 2022 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly informal assessments will be conducted by the VE teacher to ensure students are working towards their specific IEP goals in addition to iReady weekly goals to meet individual goals based on needs.

Every six weeks progress for each ESE student will be reviewed by the PSLT.

Interventions and levels of support will be determined to support student goals and progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Moody (michelle.moody@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.)

iReady Reading will be one of the evidence-based interventions used with SWD. In addition to small group lessons, students will complete 45 minutes per week on computer based iReady lessons to work toward their weekly goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This program provides students with a computer online path that is based on individual needs in addition to small group lessons used for intervention in a small group setting.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

iReady diagnostic will take place on week of September 5, 2023.

Person Responsible: Demetria Geathers (demetria.geathers@hcps.net)

By When: All SWD will be assessed during the first two weeks of September.

Diagnostic results will be reviewed and students will begin computer based and small group instruction with the VE teacher and Reading Teacher.

Person Responsible: Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

By When: Week of September 18th

Monthly progress is reviewed and discussed by PSLT.

Person Responsible: Michelle Moody (michelle.moody@hcps.net)

By When: October 26. 2023

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

39% of ELL students were proficient on the FAST Assessment given in May 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

44% of ELL students will be proficient on the FAST Assessment given in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

ELL students be monitored by the ESOL Resource Teacher weekly to ensure students are making progress on Imagine Learning and iReady weekly goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Moody (michelle.moody@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.)

Imagine Learning and iReady will be used for ELL students weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These research based programs are targeted to meet the students' individual needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The school's leadership team reviewed data to determine the funding allocations to ensure resources are allocated based on needs. The school only receives Title 1 funding to hire a full time Literacy Coach and an additional teacher to serve as a part time Science Coach and academic interventionist. Both of these additional units will be used to provide additional support to students with targeted small group interventions.

The 5 Whys Protocol revealed:

What is the problem? 22% of students in grades 3-5 are proficient in ELA.

Why did the problem occur? Students are entering each grade level 1-2 years below grade level.

Why is that? A focus on students in grades 3 - 5 and their reading comprehension has been a priority.

Why is that? Students in grades 3 - 5 are lacking the foundational skills needed to be good readers.

Why is that? A lack of focus on a targeted system to teach phonics and foundational skills in primary grades.

Why is that? Teachers need a extensive training on the science of reading and structures that support this.

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

Students will be assessed in August and September using baseline assessments. Data will be analyzed in PLCs to ensure students receive targeted interventions based on needs through the MTSS process. Foundational skills lessons will be implemented within the ELA block to ensure student learning gaps are targeted early. Students will use iReady reading to provide additional targeted support. Data will be tracked every two weeks during PLCs to ensure students' needs are met. Our VE and ESOL Resource teacher will also provide small group instruction to identified students.

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

Students will be assessed in August and September using baseline assessments. Data will be analyzed in PLCs to ensure students receive targeted interventions based on needs through the MTSS process. Foundational skills lessons will be implemented within the ELA block to ensure student learning gaps are

targeted early. Students will use iReady reading to provide additional targeted support. Data will be tracked every two weeks during PLCs to ensure students' needs are met. Our VE and ESOL Resource teacher will also provide small group instruction to identified students.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

All students in grades K-2 will achieve their typical growth gains by May 2024 based on the iReady Reading Assessment.

40% of all K-2 students will be on grade level based on the Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic in May.

40% of all K-2 students will be on grade level on PM3 STAR Assessment.

40% of all SWD will score a Level 3 or higher on STAR.

40% of all ELL students will score a Level 3 or higher on STAR.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

All students in grades 3-5 will achieve their typical growth gains by May 2024 based on the iReady Reading Assessment.

40% of all 3-5 students will be on grade level based on the Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic in May 2024.

40% of all 3-5 students will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3 in May 2024.

40% of all SWD students will score a Level 3 or higher on FAST PM3 in May 2024.

40% of all ELL students will score a Level 3 or higher on FAST PM3 in May 2024.

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.

iReady diagnostics assessments will take place in September, January, and May.

PLCs will monitor and analyze data every two weeks.

Wonders unit assessments will also be analyzed to monitor progress.

DIBELS assessments will also be used to monitor progress biweekly.

Teachers will also give weekly phonics assessments (UFLI) to monitor progress from weekly lessons and determine small group needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sekulits, Julie, julie.sekulits@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?

Students will use iReady Reading in grades K - 5 in grades 3- 5 on a daily basis as part of their Reading Rotations during the ELA block. Students who have phonics deficiencies will receive targeted small group instruction. This is in addition to the grade level (core) curriculum provided using the Wonders Curriculum and iReady toolbox resources. UFLI lessons and Flamingo Small group reading instruction will also be provided to students daily.

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?

The evidenced based practices/programs are matched to the reading areas of need for students with reading deficits based on their diagnostic assessments.

iReady toolkit lessons have proven to be successful and are researched based. These will be used for goal setting and student data chats.

UFLI lessons are research based to teach students the foundational skills needed to read. Students will also have opportunities for target small group reading instruction with flamingo reading.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>The Literacy Leadership Team (PSLT) will identify students who are not reading on grade level and develop a schedule for support and intervention. The team will analyze diagnostic results to develop a plan of action for intervention (WIN TIME/MTSS) The team will sort and group students based on needs and identify who will provide the interventions. The Team will analyze data every six weeks for each grade level to determine MTSS next steps and response to interventions.</p>	<p>Moody, Michelle, michelle.moody@hcps.net</p>
<p>The Literacy Coach will provide ongoing coaching support through collaborative planning sessions weekly and coaching sessions to ensure fidelity of interventions. Modeling of lessons will be a focus during implementation in August and September.</p>	<p>Sekulits, Julie, julie.sekulits@hcps.net</p>
<p>Assessment will take place to ensure students are making progress. After each diagnostic or progress monitoring periods, data analysis will take place during PLCs to ensure students are receiving targeted small group instruction based on specific needs. Assessments will also be used to assist with data chats with students and goal setting.</p>	<p>Geathers, Demetria, demetria.geathers@hcps.net</p>
<p>Professional Learning Needs will be determined based on Walk-through Data and student needs. UFLI professional learning was a focus during preplanning for teachers. Ongoing coaching and job-embedded professional learning opportunities will be determined by the Instructional Leadership Team.</p>	<p>Gadson Yarbrough, Delia, delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net</p>

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.

- Methods for dissemination of the School Improvement Plan include:
1. Create a QR Code Link to the plan that can be placed on paper and electronic flyers.
 2. Share the plan at the SAC Meeting and PTA meeting in August.
 3. Display the QR Code Flyer with the Link in the front office for stakeholders that come to the school.
 4. Place a link to the plan on Sheehy's Facebook and Twitter social media pages and website.
 5. Share the plan during Conference Night and quarterly Family Engagement Activities.

Progress of the plan will be shared during monthly SAC/PTA meetings. These meetings target a diverse stakeholder group. Language of the plan and progress will be shared by the SAC Chair and School Leadership Team using visuals and practical language and terms to ensure all stakeholders understand

the process and progress throughout the year. News will also be shared with families and community members through social media, school newsletters, in both paper and electronic forms.

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 plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of our scholars.

Our Problem-Solving Leadership Team consist of a team of teachers, student support service professionals, instructional coaches and administrators that meet weekly to improve the climate and culture of the school, as well as academic achievement.

Behavior and Attendance Data is reviewed at each meeting and action steps are created and implemented to improve conditions for students. Ways to help support families with resources is also discussed during these meetings. One of the goals of our team is to remove challenges and barriers students may be facing at home to ensure they are able to learn and grow at school.

Principal/AP:

- Increase school to home communication to target parents' beliefs about the importance of attendance.
- Implement quarterly parent engagement opportunities to educate parents about the importance of attendance and build positive character-building experiences for our students. This year we will also find ways to improve students arriving to school on time to ensure learning is not lost due to tardiness.

Social Worker:

- Monitor school wide attendance weekly
- Promote daily attendance with programs such as "Beat the Bell" and daily class recognitions
- Monitor interventions for students with frequent absences
- Work with teachers to ensure the fidelity of interventions is ongoing.

School Counselor:

- Incorporate effective practices and lessons that promote good attendance and positive character-building lessons with classes.

This team will work in conjunction with the SAC and PTA to promote positive school-home experiences for all stakeholders. A calendar of events will be generated to engage family in our school programs and promote positive relationships with families.

A We are Connected Night will be held in January to provide families with community resources and support.

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)

The school plans to focus on the following Instructional Priorities to strengthen the academic program and increase the quality of learning time for students.

Employ high leverage instructional practices and structures that allow all students to master grade level benchmarks. High Leverage instructional practices and structures consist of Modeling and Direct Instruction, Checks for Understanding, and Small Group Instruction.

A focus on benchmark-aligned instruction will be addressed during collaborative planning sessions to ensure a strong core instruction is implemented daily.

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))

Sheehy Elementary is a 7 Mindsets school and also a part of the STOP grant. In addition, we offer Head Start Program for students beginning at age 3. We also have a food pantry and offer families resources through the support of our Social Worker. We partner with organizations such as SEEDS and Metropolitan Ministries to provide resources for students and families. Our school also engages in the Healthy Fruits and Vegetables program. Students also receive free breakfast and lunch at Sheehy.