

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Alafia Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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

Alafia Elementary School

3535 CULBREATH RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[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 will empower all students with opportunity and support in order to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Alafia Elementary students will be compassionate, connected, and contributing citizens in our ever-changing world.

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
Tierney Jackson, Lisa	Principal	Solicit members for SAC; Share SAC By Laws; Build SAC following procedures for SAC/SIP voting; Assist in creation of SIP; Ensure SIP is communicated to all stakeholders; Ensure staff SIP voting following procedures; Advertise meetings for SAC and Public; Build agenda with SAC input; Facilitate meetings. Lead development and monitoring of SIP. Maintain records and documentation of SAC meetings/votes/minutes.
Pletcher, Elizabeth	SAC Member	SAC Chair - Attend meetings; collaborate/ assist in planning of SIP; assist in SAC agendas -share ideas and areas of concern; assist in interpreting data; publishing SAC minutes for all stakeholders. Is a voting member of SAC.

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.

The school leadership team and school staff reviewed and analyzed the student data available to us from 2023 Spring PM3 to determine strengths and needs across the content areas in comparison to the state data, district data, and previous school data. We compared progress between PM1, PM2, and PM3 in ELA and Math amongst our sub-groups. We shared the data with our SAC for input to identify strengths and needs, potential barriers, and ideas for next steps for continued growth and improvement.

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 SIP will be monitored with data gathered from PM1 and PM2, common assessments data across grade levels, along with quarterly data chats with teachers to monitor student progress. This data will be shared with PSLT, SAC, and staff in order to continue to devise next steps for continued student improvement and to ensure MTSS support for our staff and students.

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	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
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) 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	14	15	13	12	11	0	0	0	65	
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	15	
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	24	19	0	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	15	0	0	0	0	35	
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	2	0	2	11	5	0	0	0	20

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	1	4	7	2	5	2	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	20	15	14	13	14	0	0	0	78	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	3	1	8	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	20	9	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	11	15	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	23	25	17	25	25	0	0	0	117	

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	3	2	3	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	7	5	7	4	5	0	0	0	30
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	2	20	15	14	13	14	0	0	0	78	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	3	1	8	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	20	9	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	11	15	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	23	25	17	25	25	0	0	0	117	

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	3	2	3	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	7	5	7	4	5	0	0	0	30
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*	57	50	53	64	53	56	69		
ELA Learning Gains				59			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			52		
Math Achievement*	63	56	59	73	50	50	72		
Math Learning Gains				65			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			50		
Science Achievement*	53	50	54	60	59	59	67		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	59				76		

* 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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	229
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	22	Yes	1	1
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	2	1
HSP	45			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	41			

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	48			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	58			

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	57			63			53					
SWD	23			30			11				4	
ELL	50			69							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			38							2	
HSP	47			49			46				4	
MUL	52			63			50				3	
PAC												
WHT	65			71			60				4	
FRL	42			46			48				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	64	59	58	73	65	62	60					
SWD	24	46	47	46	64	58						
ELL	48	56		57	81							
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	35	64		19	64		20					
HSP	64	64	50	69	62	56	43					
MUL	71	64		71	57							
PAC												
WHT	66	55	63	81	68	71	73					
FRL	57	57	64	63	60	58	50					

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	69	57	52	72	63	50	67					76
SWD	25	50	36	33	47	20	23					
ELL	64			64								76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			40								
HSP	63	57		57	33		50					73
MUL	75			80								
PAC												
WHT	75	60	46	79	74	50	70					
FRL	59	54	42	65	59	46	63					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	62%	53%	9%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	59%	11%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	51%	0%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

According to the 2023 Florida State Science Standards Assessment, 52% of our 5th grade students scored as proficient, as compared to 2022 FSSSA where 60% of our 5th grade students scored as proficient.

Contributing factors to last year's performance would include a lack of Science foundation recognized for students from previous years due to pandemic; lower foundational skills in reading as specified in vocabulary development. We have noticed a trend in that our Science scores have gradually declined starting at the beginning of the pandemic (2019 -76%; 2021 - 67%); since the pandemic a great focus has been in promoting foundational skills across the grade levels in ELA and Math. The district data for the 2023 FSSSA indicates that 47% of 5th graders in Hillsborough were proficient in Science standards attainment and we were 4% higher at 52%.

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

According to the 2022-2023 PM3 for grades 3-5, 62% of our students were proficient in Math, and in 2021-2022, according to the FSA, 73% of our students were proficient in Math, which is an 11% decline. According to the 2022-2023 PM1 for grades 3-5, 10% of our students were proficient in Math which demonstrated that 90% of our students lacked the necessary foundation for on grade level math in grades 3-5. We are unsure at this time as how the BEST compares to the FSA in understanding

standards attainment from Florida State Standards to now BEST Standards. (District data indicates 55% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in Math on PM3)

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.

We do not have state averages at this time.

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

According to the 2022-2023 PM1 data for Math, 10% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient, and PM3 data for Math students grew to 62%, which was 52% growth. New actions the school took in the area of Math was the use of iReady Math progress monitoring data, use of small group intervention in math, and after school tutoring in the area of Math for grades 3-5 for struggling students identified through the MTSS process.

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

Student absences (78 students absent 10% or more of days)

The number of students scoring at Level 1 in ELA

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

Percent of students proficient in Science needs to increase

Percent of students in our Black Sub-group demonstrating proficiency in ELA in grades 3-5 needs to increase

Percent of students proficient in ELA needs to increase

Percent of students proficient in Math needs to increase

Number of students absent 10% or more days needs to decrease

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.

According the 2022 state assessment data, our subgroup of Black students demonstrated the greatest need for improvement. Math data trends indicate this is the subject area in most need of improvement. 19% of our Black students were proficient in Math FSA in 2022, as compared to our highest sub groups of White students at 81%, Multi-Racial students at 71%, and Hispanics at 69% for the Math FSA in 2022. In 2019 our Black sub group was at 68% proficient in Math according to the 2019 Math FSA. That is a significant drop from 68% in 2019, to 40 % in 2021 and then 19% in 2022. It should be noted that within our Black sub group 64% made gains in learning according to the 2022 Math FSA. We need to increase the number of Black students proficient in Math and continue a high rate of learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Alafia's sub group of Black/African American students will increase Math achievement by 50% as compared to PM1 (September) to PM3 (May) in the state progress monitoring assessment for 2022-2023 school year for grades 3, 4 and 5.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our progress for our Black sub group of students in Math through PM1 results and PM 2 results in Math, as well as through grade level PLC's using grade level progress monitoring data. PSLT will monitor monthly, attendance data, behavior data, and course data communicated by PLC's, and our data chats with individual teachers for our Black subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Tierney Jackson (lisa.tierney-jackson@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 and content area PLC's focus on the MTSS process for tiered students and design intervention based on best practices, dependent on student needs. Differentiated instruction/resources/instructional groups that are fluid in order to support using interventions based on students' individualized needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our school has a great focus within our PLC's in working to increase student gains. By identifying barriers for students as individuals within our Black sub group, we can identify appropriate interventions and differentiated groupings/instruction/ resources to close learning gaps which will result in learning gains.

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.

Hold PLC/Collaboration meetings twice monthly across grade levels to discuss small group development in response to progress monitoring data and to discuss interventions differentiated to address needs of students in relation to data analysis

- * Quarterly data chats with members from PSLT

- * Use of state assessments PM1 and PM2 to assist in identification of students with needs and to growth monitor

- * Provide ELP for Math

- * PSLT review attendance data, behavior data, progress monitoring data shared by grade level PLC's monthly in order to progress monitor students in our Black sub group and design intervention to share with PLC's as appropriate for increased learning gains

Person Responsible: Lisa Tierney Jackson (lisa.tierney-jackson@hcps.net)

By When: Beginning 8/23 and on-going through 5/24

#2. 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.

Area of focus as related to a positive culture and environment will be attendance. According to the 2022 data, we had 78 students who were absent for 10% or more of the school year. 3% of the 78 students were from our Black subgroups and 6% were of our white subgroup. 74% of the Black subgroup had unexcused absences and 38% of our White subgroup were unexcused absences. This tells us our Black subgroup families need to be connected with to encourage reporting of absences so we can work together in understanding time out of school and assist as appropriate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of our Black/African American students with unexcused absences will decrease from 74% to 30% as compared from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our attendance reports monthly at our PSLT meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Tierney Jackson (lisa.tierney-jackson@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 monitor the attendance reports monthly. Students who reach at least 5 unexcused absences will be contacted by the teacher. Students who reach 10 unexcused absences will be contacted by the school social worker to assist the family with a plan to help get the children to school. We will monitor through MTSS process in PLC's and PSLT monthly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By monitoring attendance and connecting with families, and offering families assistance it is our hope to encourage students to be in school and for families to report when students are absent so we can stay connected in offering support and ensuring students do not get behind in course studies. We can also offer Tier 2/Tier 3 incentives for students we are assisting that go beyond our Tier 1 incentives for attendance.

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.

Monthly review of attendance reports by subgroups in PLC's and PSLT
Teachers connect with families for at least 5 unexcused absences

School social worker connects with families for 10 unexcused absences

Utilize MTSS process for Tier 2 and Tier 3 needs with specific plan to assist students

Person Responsible: Lisa Tierney Jackson (lisa.tierney-jackson@hcps.net)

By When: 9/23 ongoing through 5/24

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).

We will utilize our ELP budget to ensure students performing at Tier 2/3 within our Black subgroup are invited to after school tutoring in areas as identified as a need in grades 3,4,5.