

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Hunter's Green 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Hunter's Green Elementary School

9202 HIGHLAND OAK DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[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.

The educators, staff and volunteers of Hunter's Green Elementary School are committed to:

- * Providing students with the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to become productive contributors to society.
- * Actively involving the home, school, and community in providing resources to meet the needs of individual students in developing traits for self-fulfillment and participation in the school climate that will carry forth into an ever-changing global society.
- * Continually assessing and refining the educational processes to produce lifelong learners able to challenge the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hunter's Green Elementary School students will become productive contributors to society as lifelong learners and decision makers living in harmony with self and others.

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
Libby, Nicole	Principal	Oversee day to day operations of the school.
Koehler, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of elementary school.
LeBlanc, Keli	School Counselor	Working with teachers and students with social emotional learning. Assists in identifying students that need additional support and guides teachers with MTSS.
Masino, Lauren	Other	Monitors and provides assistance to our ESE students and staff.
Provonscha-Bucher, Leslie	Psychologist	Assists in identifying students that need additional support and guides teachers with MTSS.
SequeiraTorres, Diana	Instructional Media	Serves as an additional resource to help teachers and students within ELA.
Lilius, Michelle	ELL Compliance Specialist	Monitors our ELL students and provides instruction based on their needs.

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 met to review the data from the 2022-2023 school year. This data included FAST and STAR data, teacher observation data, and Panorama student data. Based on our analysis of the data, we developed our SIP plan. This data was then shared with the entire staff and staff members were provided an opportunity to provide suggestions or changes to the SIP. Once the staff provided their input, we then brought the same information to SAC and provided an opportunity for SAC members to provide input to the SIP. Using the feedback from leadership, staff, and SAC, the SIP plan was developed and presented to all for approval.

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 instructional leadership team will review data monthly to determine if the strategies and action steps outlined in the SIP are helping to improve the achievement of students. During quarterly academic

reviews, in depth conversations around data and various subgroups will be held to determine changes needed to address any lack of progression.

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	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
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: B 2018-19: B 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	1	22	31	27	22	19	0	0	0	122	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	10	14	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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.	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	3	5	0	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
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	21	19	15	12	11	0	0	0	78	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	6	16	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	12	12	0	0	0	30	
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		

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	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	21	19	15	12	11	0	0	0	78	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	6	16	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	12	12	0	0	0	30	
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		

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	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	73	50	53	76	53	56	70		
ELA Learning Gains				72			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			38		
Math Achievement*	78	56	59	81	50	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				77			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			43		
Science Achievement*	74	50	54	61	59	59	62		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	82	59	59	74			53		

* 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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	567
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	70			
HSP	70			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	61			

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	45			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	59			
HSP	69			

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	74			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	60			

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	73			78			74					82
SWD	39			37			37				4	
ELL	50			67			62				5	85
AMI												
ASN	84			94			88				5	100
BLK	63			71			67				4	
HSP	64			72			68				5	79
MUL	67			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	78			81			78				4	
FRL	53			63			60				5	73

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	76	72	62	81	77	64	61					74
SWD	28	51	53	43	60	67	9					50
ELL	51	66	64	82	82		47					74
AMI												
ASN	81	71		92	80		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
BLK	61	72	61	63	70	50	36					
HSP	69	63	64	74	78	65	50					92
MUL	73	70		83	70		75					
PAC												
WHT	83	78	60	86	81	88	69					
FRL	61	64	55	68	69	60	40					64

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	70	57	38	70	46	43	62					53
SWD	20	38	33	32	29	36	22					40
ELL	64	80		76	50		60					53
AMI												
ASN	81	75		89	40		69					
BLK	58	54		46	46		54					
HSP	63	48	33	51	22		35					64
MUL	65			78								
PAC												
WHT	76	58		81	60		78					
FRL	58	49	44	52	40	38	57					55

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	73%	53%	20%	54%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	54%	21%	58%	17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	46%	27%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	55%	26%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	59%	23%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	79%	53%	26%	55%	24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	47%	28%	51%	24%

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 data component showing the lowest performance on the FSA 2023, was science with 74% of 5th grade students showing proficiency. In 5th grade we saw profound growth in the area of science proficiency, however, our school proficiency is still below 80% which would be closer to the intermediate reading and math scores.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was found in the subgroup of our ELL student population. Potential factors for this decline could be that while there were intentional interventions, the prior year focus was on a different minority subgroup.

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.

The data components that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average are as follows:

3 Math FL: 59% to 81% at HGE

4 Math FL: 61% to 82% HGE

5 Math FL: 55% to 79% at HGE

3 Reading FL: 50% to 73% at HGE
4 Reading FL: 57% to 75% at HGE
5 Reading FL: 55% to 73% at HGE

Hunter's Green is a suburban, high SES School with high parent and family involvement, Hunter's Green has 120 (tested) free or reduced-price lunch students, making FRL 35.6% of the student population.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is science FSA scores. The new action believed to have contributed to this success is the implementation of SIP plan 2022-2023, STEM team PLC's, facilities on campus including our science resource room and the building's MAKERSPACE lab. The district resource teacher, Kristen Skinner, led weekly planning sessions for our 5th grade teacher, and hands on investigations, as well as purposeful planning with materials all increased.

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

Two potential areas of concern would be our attendance overall. We have 78 students with 10 or more absences. and 122 students with 10 more absences. Tardies and early sign ours could be a potential area of concern as well.

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

The highest SIP priorities are:

1. Expanding school culture through the 7 mindsets
2. Continuing Science growth during FSA changes
3. Increasing over all student attendance with the school's new social worker.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Based on the 2023 FSA scores, 74% of students in grade five scored at a proficiency level of three or higher, This is an increase in proficiency over the past three years. By continuing to focus on science, the instructional improvements will include hands-on learning experiences, students taking ownership of their learning through discussion, elaboration of their thinking and frequent monitoring and feedback provided to students. These steps will support an improvement in student proficiency on the Grade Five FSA Science test in 2024.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome is the increase overall proficiency in science as measured by state and district assessments as of May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The administration will participate in fidelity walk throughs, review progress monitoring data and both attend PLC meetings and review notes and PLC agendas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Libby (nicole.libby@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.)

Students will be provided with opportunities for ownership of their learning through projects and processes, discussion in whole and small groups, collaboration with classmates, as well as opportunities to elaborate on their own thinking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This evidence-based strategy is based on research which supports the idea that when students take ownership of their learning and teach reciprocally, they will see an increase in information retention.

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.

Teachers will design and implement hands on learning opportunities through investigations and experiments within the science instructional block. Opportunities will be provided for students to share and explain their thinking and engage in meaningful discussions with their classmates. Immediate and constructive feedback will be provided to students within whole and small groups to further their understanding of the content.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Koehler (jacqueline.koehler@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: By May of 2024.

#2. 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.

Using the 7 Mindsets program from Mindsets Based Solutions, we will monitor the impact of social/emotional solutions and their implementation on the culture of our students. Student emotional regulation, self-efficacy and social awareness will increase to ensure a safe and positive school environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome is to increase emotional regulation, self-efficacy and social awareness amongst students from the fall 2023 Panorama survey to the spring 2024 Panorama survey.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored with fidelity walk throughs, as well as review of student behavior tracker data and grade level, PLC agendas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Libby (nicole.libby@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.)

Teachers will utilize the 7 Mindsets curriculum vocabulary as common language and initiate the use of the 7 Mindsets program to fortify self-efficacy and cultivate emotional intelligence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy is based on school-wide student need, to increase resiliency, character & life skills by monitoring their individual needs through the analysis of the Panorama survey given twice annually.

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.

1. Teachers will attend 7 Mindsets training session on 8/10/23.
2. Students will collaborate with classes in other grade levels to work toward meeting school wide culture goals.
3. All teachers, students and staff will participate in monthly school wide pep rallies as a method of tracking and celebrating goals met from "team based" data collection.

Person Responsible: Nicole Libby (nicole.libby@hcps.net)

By When: Goal will be on going with results met prior to the Spring 2024 Panorama survey.