Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

1721 N MACDILL AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[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.

We cultivate in each student the desire to grow in wisdom, to nurture an open and curious mind, and to serve others with a generous spirit.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to create an advanced elementary program where students become aware of the shared humanity that binds all people together and develop respect for the variety of cultures and attitudes that add to the richness of life.

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
Riveiro, Denyse	Principal	Instructional leader to oversee instruction, physical plant, and faculty and staff effectiveness.
Bode, Teresa	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader, behavior management, assessment coordinator, and logistics manager.
Hartle, Angela	Other	IB Curriculum specialist to oversee delivery of magnet theme. Coordinator of schoolwide events, field trips, and guest speakers. Marketing manager.

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.

Stakeholder involvement in the development of the SIP is done primarily through SAC. Our SAC consists of teachers, business partners, parents, and school staff. SAC reviews the SIP at the end of the school year and evaluates progress monitoring data to decide on focus areas for the next school year's SIP. Recommendations on ongoing and new SIP focus areas are brought to the staff during preplanning. Staff are given the opportunity to suggest new focus areas and to discuss progress on current focus areas.

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))

Our SIP progress is primarily monitored by SAC. SAC meets each month and regularly reviews formative and summative assessment data to monitor progress on our SIP focus areas. Our staff reviews progress monitoring data at quarterly report card meetings and MTSS meetings throughout the year.

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 KG-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	45%
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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	5	4	5	2	1	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	3	6	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	1	7	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	
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	1	4	5	3	0	2	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	1	7	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	7

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	7
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	1	4	5	3	0	2	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	1	7	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	7

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	7
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*	75	50	53	78	53	56	76		
ELA Learning Gains				72			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				70			43		
Math Achievement*	76	56	59	81	50	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				82			83		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77			57		
Science Achievement*	67	50	54	72	59	59	78		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	73	59	59	63			79		

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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	595
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	60			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	56			
HSP	66			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	92			
FRL	65			

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	42			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK	75			
HSP	71			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	70			

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	75			76			67					73
SWD	60			60							2	
ELL	65			59							4	73
AMI												
ASN	78			94							2	
BLK	57			67			40				4	
HSP	68			67			58				5	63
MUL	72			72							2	
PAC												
WHT	90			88			100				4	
FRL	64			64			52				5	75

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	78	72	70	81	82	77	72					63
SWD	31	40		40	58							
ELL	57	60		71	76		58					63
AMI												
ASN	93			100								
BLK	75	80		76	81		64					
HSP	68	64	69	73	78	76	68					68
MUL	79			79								
PAC												
WHT	91	79		89	84		71					
FRL	68	69	63	71	80	77	59					71

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	76	64	43	78	83	57	78					79
SWD	46			46								
ELL	54	60		77	90							79
AMI												
ASN	87	100		96	100		100					
BLK	59			59								
HSP	68	50		70	72		65					68
MUL	70			100								
PAC												
WHT	95	64		88	93		100					
FRL	62	41	20	63	58	45	56					73

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	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	54%	21%	58%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	46%	32%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	59%	23%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	53%	29%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	47%	20%	51%	16%

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.

In 2022 the data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA Achievement of our Students With Disabilities (SWD). Overall, 81% of our students were proficient in math and 78% proficient in ELA, and 72% in science. Although these proficiency levels exceed the state and district levels, they do not exceed our school's pre-covid proficiency levels. Our ELA and math proficiency levels are trending upward since pre-covid but the effects of e-learning and students not being in school, learning with other students can still be seen in the classroom. Collaboration and focusing skills were weakened during e-learning (especially with the SWD population). We will renew our focus on active reading strategies and the Junior Great Books Inquiry model for reading. In math, we will have an increased focus on differentiated, small group instruction using hands-on manipulatives and authentic application.

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

Our greatest decline from the prior year was in science achievement. We feel that the lack of hands-on science and the decline in reading proficiency during e-learning are the strongest contributing factors to this decline.

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.

All of Macfarlane Park's data points exceed that of the state average.

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

In 2022, grade 4 math students increased from 75% proficiency to 93%. Most notably, our bottom quartile students making learning gains increased from 57% to 77%.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, an area of concern may be the increased number of students who demonstrated course failure in math.

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

Increase academic proficiency to pre-covid levels, develop stronger SEL supports for students, further develop soft skills for thinking, socializing, communication, self-management, and researching.

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 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.

Data from the 2022 Student Insight Survey demonstrated a deficiency in emotional regulation and growth mindset.

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

A decrease in the number of students indicating they struggle with emotional regulation and growth mindset on the Student Insight Survey

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

Monitor the number of students referred to guidance for self-regulation concerns. Monitor the student behavior reflection sheets and the ability for students to identify ways to grow and improve. Monitor Insight survey results at the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Bode (teresa.bode@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.)

Provide social/emotional lessons and support to students and parents. Institute Appreciative Inquiry strategies in the classroom to promote positive thinking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A student's day is filled with strong academic instruction, leaving little time for social/emotional support. Targeting social/emotional activities and Appreciative Inquiry techniques for both students and parents will support families in regulating emotions and developing a positive growth mindset.

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.

Identify students who demonstrated a deficiency in emotional regulation and growth mindset on the student Insight survey.

Person Responsible: Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Have staff members select identified students to meet with throughout the year to build emotional regulation and growth mindset skills.

Person Responsible: Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

By When: October 1, 2023

Compare student SEL survey results at beginning and end of year and check in with teachers monthly on contacts made with identified students.

Person Responsible: Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

In 2022, 81% of our students were proficient in math and 78% proficient in ELA. Although these proficiency levels exceed the state and district levels, they do not exceed our school's pre-covid proficiency levels.

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

An increase in the number of level 3 students who are proficient in ELA and math.

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

Level 2 students will be identified early in the year and monitored through the use of a variety of assessments (iReady, district baseline and mid-year assessments, running records etc.) to monitor growth. In addition, participation in Extended Learning Program (ELP) and re-teach math labs will be monitored for these students. Walk-throughs will be used by the principal and assistant principal to ensure differentiated support of targeted students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Bode (teresa.bode@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.)

We will renew our focus on SEM-R strategies and the Junior Great Books Inquiry model for reading. In math, we will have an increased focus on differentiated, small group instruction using hands-on manipulatives and authentic application in our math labs and classroom instruction. ELP services will also continue.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the accelerated model of on-grade level instruction, teachers have been trained in scaffold activities and use of multiple assessment checkpoints towards a learning outcome.

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.

Identify level 2 ELA and math students and their stretch goals.

Person Responsible: Teresa Bode (teresa.bode@hcps.net)

By When: After PM 1 assessments have been completed.

During report card meetings and MTSS meetings, identify small group strategies and classroom practices to be used at each grade level.

Person Responsible: Teresa Bode (teresa.bode@hcps.net)

By When: Quarterly

#3. 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.

In reflecting on the comments from evaluators at our most recent IB evaluation, it was noted that our school should further develop plans for delivering the IB Approaches to Learning Skills (Research skills, Communication Skills, Social Skills, Self-Management Skills, and Thinking Skills). These are lifelong learning skills that students will need to be successful in the 21st century.

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

A completed scope and sequence of objectives across all grade levels K-5, relating to the IB Approaches to Learning Skills and a bank of learning experiences to support the development of these skills.

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

Evidence will be present in the grade level IB planners through documentation of learning experiences that explicitly teach these soft skills and offer opportunities for authentic application.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@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.)

Grade level teams will meet with the IB Coordinator weekly to add learning experiences to the IB planners and brainstorm ideas for the scope and sequence document. An online collaboration tool such as Padlet and/or Toddle will be used to capture ideas and ensure access by all stakeholders, including SAC.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Electronic collaboration tools allow for multiple stakeholders to participate in discussion and planning. Allocating time each week for dedicated IB meetings allows for a concentrated focus on reaching goals and meeting timeline expectations related to the task.

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.

Create an online environment for collaboration and brainstorming of ideas related to teaching the Approaches to Learning Skills.

Person Responsible: Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

By When: August 2023

Meet weekly in grade level teams to fine tune authentic learning experiences appropriate for each grade level relating to the Approaches to Learning Skills.

Person Responsible: Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing weekly

Onboard all staff to an IB electronic platform (Toddle) used to plan for and capture evidence relating to the development of IB Approaches to Learning Skills.

Person Responsible: Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023