

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Anderson 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Anderson Elementary School

3910 W FAIR OAKS AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[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.

To provide a safe learning environment that will empower students to become life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring all students to reach their full potential.

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
Sierra, Lydia	Principal	<p>The leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core leadership team is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RTI/MTSS process: at the core (tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. 5. Facilitate a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility. 6. Facilitate and monitor site based professional development. 7. Foster leadership development of teacher leaders.
Kim, Catherine	Assistant Principal	<p>The leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core leadership team is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RTI/MTSS process: at the core (tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. 5. Facilitate a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility. 6. Facilitate and monitor site based professional development. 7. Foster leadership development of teacher leaders.
Behrens, Brian	SAC Member	<p>The leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core leadership team is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RTI/MTSS process: at the core (tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. <p>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.</p>

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.

During a staff meeting, all teachers and administrators came together to look at the data and decide what steps that we could take to raise each of our areas of focus to promote student achievement.

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))

Quarterly, our leadership team will review assessment data , focused on our subgroup, as well as re-evaluate teacher morale with a check in survey. By doing this we will be able to monitor the effectiveness of the action steps towards our areas of focus. After this analysis, a faculty meeting will be called to determine if revision is 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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) 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: C 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	4	8	9	10	7	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	7	7	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	8	17	0	0	0	33	
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		

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	1	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	12

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	14	7	12	8	8	0	0	0	49	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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.	3	7	3	8	3	2	0	0	0	26	

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	14	7	12	8	8	0	0	0	49	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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.	3	7	3	8	3	2	0	0	0	26	

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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*	63	50	53	54	53	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				57			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			91		
Math Achievement*	63	56	59	55	50	50	48		
Math Learning Gains				61			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			82		
Science Achievement*	59	50	54	40	59	59	42		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	59				55		

* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	247
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	23	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	68			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	65			

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	55			

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	1	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	47			

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	63			63			59					
SWD	17			25							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			42							2	
HSP	71			64							3	
MUL	42			50							2	

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	65			68			63				4	
FRL	57			54			47				4	

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	54	57	45	55	61	42	40					
SWD	31	48	36	31	35	25	27					
ELL	55			55								
AMI												
ASN	70			80								
BLK	23	60		23	33							
HSP	53	47		47	74		25					
MUL	54			62								
PAC												
WHT	63	57		65	62		47					
FRL	44	56	47	44	61	44	36					

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	52	71	91	48	56	82	42					55
SWD	21			28								
ELL	53			60								55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			24								
HSP	46	76		46	47		21					
MUL	62			46								
PAC												
WHT	57	80		54	67		57					
FRL	48	70		41	48		30					

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	62%	53%	9%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	54%	8%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	46%	12%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	59%	9%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	51%	1%

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.

The percentage of 5th grade students proficient in Math was 47%. Due to a vacancy in 5th grade the class size was over 43 students.

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

The percentage of 5th grade students proficient in Math declined from 60% in 2022 to 47% in 2023. Due to a vacancy in 5th grade the class size was over 43 students.

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.

State average was 55% of 5th grade students being proficient in Math, and Anderson's average of 5th graders being proficient in Math was 47%.

In 4th grade, the state average was 61% of student being proficient in Math. Anderson's average of 4th graders proficient in Math was 70%. The quality and effectiveness of instruction due to intentional planning and strong understanding of BEST benchmarks and standards contributed to the number of students being proficient in Math.

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

The percentage of 4th grade students proficient in Math grew from 44% in 2022 to 70% in 2023. The teacher who taught Math to all 4th grade students regularly worked with district staff and participated in professional development to collaborate and practices effective teaching strategies.

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

According to the EWS data, attendance of 10% or more days is a concern for our school. A total of 38 students fell into this indicator. Also, our number of students in 3rd grade that scored a level 1 on FAST ELA was 12.

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

Improve ELA and Math FAST scores for our level 1 students.

Raise staff morale to encourage teacher retention.

Improve student and teacher attendance.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

Historical data shows less than half of our African American students are proficient in Math based on state assessments. 45% of our African American students showed proficiency in Math on the FAST PM3 assessment in May of 2023. The year prior, 36% of our African American students showed proficiency in Math based on the FSA Spring 2022 assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our intended outcome is to raise the achievement level of our African American students, specifically in Math, from 45% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Walkthroughs, data chats, progress monitoring assessments, and formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@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.)

Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments and iReady data will be utilized to drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and targeted interventions. Instructional support will be provided by our district resource teacher/coach and teacher leaders to identify instructional strategies that specifically target our African American students. All teachers will plan collaboratively to create standards-based instruction that meets the needs of our students in the subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing resources, data discussion, and collaborative planning opportunities, teachers will be able to monitor this subgroup of students. Appropriate instruction and interventions necessary for academic gains will be determined as part of our collaborative work between school-based instructors and district level resource support personnel.

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.

Teachers and administration will identify African American students at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to yield learning gain and /or proficiency.

Person Responsible: Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

By When: September 2023

Identify Math standards African American's had the least achievement in on the FSA.

Person Responsible: Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

By When: September 2023

Develop targeted interventions, such as: ELP opportunities during the day, mentor/buddy system, attendance goals and incentives, and positive/consistent communication with family members.

Person Responsible: Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

By When: October 2023

All teachers will work and collaborate with our instructional coaches to design and monitor instruction.

Person Responsible: Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing all year.

Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible: Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing quarterly.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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 school Insight survey results showed a lack of positive culture between teachers as well as administration.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our average percentage on the Insight culture survey under the domain Teacher Retention will increase from 33% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Culture feedback surveys, attendance at culture building events.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Behrens (brian.behrens@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.)

To curb declining staff morale utilizing staff input and feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Allowing staff to submit feedback about the steps consistently and immediate. They will also be able to submit anonymously so that they can be honest with their responses.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Administration visits and participates in classroom activities more often.

Person Responsible: Lydia Sierra (lydia.sierra@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing monthly.

Staff recognitions in their preferred method of acknowledgment.

Person Responsible: Lydia Sierra (lydia.sierra@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing weekly.

Staff members will make a conscious effort to greet students and colleagues, in a positive manner.

Person Responsible: Brian Behrens (brian.behrens@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing daily.

Administration will recognize good staff attendance.

Person Responsible: Lydia Sierra (lydia.sierra@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing quarterly.

Social events will be offered inside and outside of school for faculty to attend if desired, to boost staff comradery.

Person Responsible: Brian Behrens (brian.behrens@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing monthly.

Faculty will be encouraged to attend afterschool activities to build overall school relationships.

Person Responsible: Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

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 administration and SAC chair will meet quarterly to discuss needs based on the plans for intervention within our SIP. We will follow up with ILT and our Team leaders to collect data and make decisions to prioritize funds and allocate accordingly.