

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mcdonald 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	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

McDonald Elementary School

501 W PRUETT RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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 physically and emotionally safe school environment where all stakeholders believe all students can and will succeed. To create a collaboration between administration, teachers, parents, and students focused on increased academic achievement. To instill data-driven practices grounded in student-success goals and celebrated when high-levels of effort and accountability are reached.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing ALL of our students for the road to success.

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
Ham, Deena	Principal	
Markle-Silva, Christina	Assistant Principal	
Ramirez, Liliana	Other	
Reeves, Lauren	Other	

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.

Surveys were provided to all stakeholders for input. This data was used in the development of the School Improvement Plan.

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 regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards weekly. Student and teacher data will be analyzed weekly during Professional Learning Committee meetings. If progression is not being made for specific students or subgroups of students then the plan will be altered, monitored for fidelity and data will be gathered and reviewed. This will be a continuous process to ensure growth for all 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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: B 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	37	38	35	30	24	0	0	0	165	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	39	21	0	0	0	0	60	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	37	14	0	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	37	36	0	0	0	118	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	31	49	0	0	0	121	
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	7	19	8	0	0	0	34

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	2	2	11	3	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	50	31	63	31	31	0	0	0	206	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	25	26	0	0	0	90	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	21	27	0	0	0	78	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	35	18	24	27	17	33	0	0	0	154	

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	10	15	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	50	31	63	31	31	0	0	0	206	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	25	26	0	0	0	90	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	21	27	0	0	0	78	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	35	18	24	27	17	33	0	0	0	154	

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	10	15	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

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*	32	50	53	33	53	56	33		
ELA Learning Gains				60			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			50		
Math Achievement*	38	56	59	51	50	50	31		
Math Learning Gains				80			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72			27		
Science Achievement*	34	50	54	34	59	59	41		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	59	59	66			48		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	178
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56

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	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	16	Yes	4	4
ELL	28	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL	30	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	34	Yes	1	
FRL	33	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	3	3
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	59			

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	48			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	55			

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	32			38			34					48
SWD	19			11			8				4	
ELL	19			31			15				5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			32			36				4	
HSP	31			38			30				5	48
MUL	30			30							2	
PAC												
WHT	31			39			37				4	
FRL	28			34			31				5	47

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	33	60	54	51	80	72	34					66
SWD	4	17		19	50							
ELL	24	52	50	38	82		20					66
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	59		52	81		25					
HSP	34	61	53	54	85	77	35					69
MUL	27	60		57								
PAC												
WHT	33	60	50	47	73	62	33					
FRL	31	59	52	49	79	70	36					66

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	33	42	50	31	28	27	41					48
SWD	4	36		4	8							
ELL	24	40		29	50							48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			50								
HSP	26	32		31	33		41					47
MUL	23			38								
PAC												
WHT	33	44		24	19		41					
FRL	30	39	50	28	26	30	36					47

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	40%	53%	-13%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	54%	-10%	58%	-14%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	41%	55%	-14%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	53%	-18%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	47%	-13%	51%	-17%

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.

English Language Arts showed the lowest performance. Our students struggle with vocabulary and reading comprehension.

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

Math showed the greatest decline. The previous year McDonald had a math coach that was able to model best practices and provide coaching cycles. This year McDonald did not have a mathematics coach and had a new curriculum to implement.

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.

English Language Arts and Mathematics both had a 17% gap from the state average. Our students lack the ability to decode and analyze word parts. This impacts success in all three areas of state testing.

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

English Language Arts improved in achievement. As a school we insured that Professional Learning Communities were held prior to instructional planning. Data discussed during PLC's was used to create deliberate, purposeful and individualized small group instruction.

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

The number of students earning a level 1 in English Language Arts and Mathematics is an area of concern.

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

Small group instruction and implementing UFLI throughout our school to increase reading abilities of all students.

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 Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Description: Employ high leverage instructional practices/structures that allow students to master grade level benchmarks/standards. Specific focus will be placed on providing assistance to all teachers in their planning and execution of high-quality small group instruction. This support will specifically target instructional delivery methods that require students to actively engage in the learning process, as well as tier 2 instruction aimed at narrowing the achievement gap and achieving proficiency in grade-level benchmarks.

Historical data shows that McDonald students struggle to meet proficiency targets in ELA, Math, and Science. According to 2023 FAST PM3 results, 36% of students were proficient in ELA and 40% of students were proficient in Math. According to 2023 FSSA results, 34% of students were proficient in Science. McDonald has established a robust foundation for the core instruction through regular common planning sessions, professional learning communities (PLCs), and coaching assistance. While the core instruction is well-established, it is important to supplement it with high-quality small group instruction to reinforce the core concepts and guide students towards achieving proficiency in grade-level benchmarks. Teachers continue to demonstrate a need for support in the area of small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By October 2023, at least 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data. By December 2023, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data.

This will result in grades 3-5 FAST/FSSA proficiency scores increasing in ELA, Math, and Science (see breakdown below):

- Increase ELA proficiency from 36% to 54%
- Increase Math proficiency from 40% to 54%
- Increase Science proficiency from 34% to 50%

Monitoring:

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

School administration team will regularly attend weekly common planning and PLC sessions to ensure planning and teacher support are in alignment with teacher needs in the focus area of small group instruction. In addition, walkthrough look-for trend data will be collected and shared with teachers regularly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deena Ham (deena.ham@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.)

The evidenced-based strategy being used to support this area of focus is Teacher Clarity. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning Indicators, strong Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75, which falls in the "Zone of Desired Effects". Teacher Clarity is described as helping students gauge their own progress

through the use of success criteria, and intentional and deliberate feedback. In addition, strong teacher clarity is evident when the teacher and students are partners in explaining the intended learning targets.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This evidenced-based strategy was selected to support the target area of focus because with strong teacher clarity on all learning targets (both core and small group instruction), students will be more in alignment with their own learning goals. In addition, according to John Hattie's research, actions falling in the range of 0.40 and above, learning extends beyond that which was expected from attending school for one school year. Due to the significant gaps our students demonstrate, we need to employ evidence-based strategies that will support larger than one year's growth.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

Create a classroom culture that is intentional in developing students' connection within the school community and provide them with constructive responses to undesirable behavior at school.

Rationale: Due to the trauma Covid-19 may have caused we need to be prepared to address the effects. Student absenteeism rose 3.1 percent from prior year with SWD/ESE and ELL students accounting for 1/3 of the total absenteeism for the year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our attendance will increase to 90 percent for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Community School Resource Teacher, Parent Liaison and classroom teachers will follow up with students who have absences to determine additional needs that these students may have in order to attend school each day.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Reeves (lauren.reeves@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.)

Faculty will reach out to their students once they have missed two days. Any absences after two days will be reported to the Community Resource Teacher or Parent Liaison so that they may reach out to the family to see if there is a need that we can assist with to get the student back in school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing accountability among student and parents to attend school regularly by communicating with them through phone calls or home visits will show that their student matters to the school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

School SAC and Leadership team review data and come to a consensus on the most appropriate way to allocate resources and funding to support student growth and success. School improvement funds are allocated towards computer software programs to enhance active and intellectual engagement with personalized instruction. Funds are also allocated for Literacy Coaches to ensure that faculty members have the support needed to understand the depth and intentions of the standards and to support with the implementation of UFLI.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Area of focus is Phonics. Every classroom will be utilizing UFLI as an instructional tool. Students will develop awareness of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts and write and recognize words. Teachers will ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension. In grade K, 44% of our students scored below the 40th percentile on STAR. In grade 1, 71% of our students scored below the 40th percentile on STAR. In grade 2, 58% of our students scored below the 40th percentile on STAR. We will be using progress monitoring of UFLI to ensure that 50% or more students will be on track to pass statewide standardized assessments.

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

Area of focus is Phonics. Every classroom will be utilizing UFLI as an instructional tool. Students will develop awareness of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts and write and recognize words. Teachers will ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension. In grade 3, 78% of our students scored below a level 3 on FAST. In grade 4, 51% of our students scored

below a level 3 on FAST. In grade 5, 61% of our students scored below a level 3 on FAST. We will be utilizing UFLI for whole group and then small group interventions.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of K-2 grade students scoring proficient on the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system will be 50% by the end of year STAR ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of 3-5 grade students scoring proficient on the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system will be 50% by the end of year FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Administration and Literacy Coaches will collect and monitor planning of UFLI lessons, cooperative learning, questioning and discussion instructional strategies. Administration and Literacy Coaches will conduct walkthroughs and observations to monitor implementation of UFLI. Administration and Literacy Coaches will collect qualitative data that can be quantifiable; data will be used to improve standards-based instruction and learning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ham, Deena, deena.ham@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Scaffolding, systematic and explicit whole group and small group instruction increases comprehension that

leads to productive student conversation and provides a window into student understandings and misconceptions by incorporating structures and strategies that encourage student discussion, ownership of work, and active engagement.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Scaffolding, systematic and explicit small group and whole group instruction enables students to retain knowledge of the material and allows teachers and students to attend to misconceptions and misunderstandings to master B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Coaches, ELA lead teachers and administration will plan for and implement coaching cycles for identified teachers to support deeper content knowledge, strong pedagogical practices, and effective teaching practices in both core instruction and small group instruction. Literacy Coaches and ELA lead teachers will use a variety of coaching supports including (but not limited to) modeling instruction, co-teaching, and side-by-side coaching. Teachers engaging in coaching cycle collaborations will have the opportunity to set and evaluate individual instructional goals with their coach to gauge progress.</p> <p>Monitor: Literacy Coaches, ELA lead teachers and administration will review coaching cycle goals and classroom walkthrough data to monitor teacher progress.</p>	<p>Ham, Deena, deena.ham@hcps.net</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The dissemination of the SIP to stakeholders happens through our school webpage, school newsletter, SAC meetings and PTA meetings. When possible, interpreters are available to assist in reaching all stakeholders present. www.hillsboroughschool.org/mcdonald

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

McDonald Elementary School will be holding monthly family events to engage the community. These nights are in addition to our parent conferences, parent information meetings, SAC meetings and PTA meetings. Agendas go home daily with our students along with weekly information folders. Newsletters are disseminated to parents and our website is kept up to date. Parent link messages will go out as needed to keep parents/guardians informed.
www.hillsboroughschool.org/mcdonald

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

McDonald is implementing UFLI school-wide this year to prepare students and fill in any gaps that students may have in the foundational skills needed to be successful readers. We will continue to use iReady to ensure that our students who are ready to be enriched can be enriched on an individualized basis along with the enrichment provided by teachers.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Guidance lessons are done monthly in all classrooms. Staff meet regularly to discuss any mental-health services, mentoring or other strategies that may need to be provided to specific students. PBIS is used throughout the school to assist in improving students' skills inside and outside the academic classroom.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

McDonald uses PBIS to assist all students. MTSS meetings are used to discuss any students who are not seeing success with our Tier 1 program. These students are then provided an Individualized behavior plan that is created in an effort to intervene early with daily or weekly check-ins with school-based mentors.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers have a weekly schedule that includes time in professional learning communities, cooperative planning sessions and MTSS collaboration meetings to work with their colleagues and instructional coaches. These opportunities provide support and professional development within each area. This supportive environment assists in retaining effective teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Children in early childhood education programs are encouraged to attend our monthly community events. Kindergarten round-up is held in the spring which allows the families to come in and visit the school and hear about elementary school.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No